

# BLASTING AHEAD

No. CCXXXIV (234)

January 7, 2012

The modernism of today's churchmen is the ultimate suicide of mind and soul. Will the New Year see God blasting clean?

If some readers found last week's "Eleison Comments" a little dark for the beginning of a new year, I do apologize, and I promise that this week's will end on a more hopeful quote. But the truth of the matter is that, as I am told, many people are still blissfully unaware of how serious is the world's impending economic calamity. Worse, they do not grasp the pre-apocalyptic gravity of the crisis in the Church. Let us dwell for a moment on the latter.

The vision even of some priests within the Society of St Pius X is that the SSPX is a normal religious Congregation while today's Rome is not excessively abnormal. It is true that Archbishop Lefebvre spoke very harshly of Vatican II and of the "antichrists" in the Vatican, but in the 20 years that have passed since his death, things have changed for the better. We now have a Pope, they think, who is a Traditionalist at heart, as is proved by his liberation of the Tridentine Mass and by his "remission" of the 1988 "excommunication" of the four SSPX bishops. So with just a little flexibility on each side surely Rome and the SSPX can arrive at some arrangement whereby Rome gives back to the SSPX that respectability which it should never have lost, while the SSPX can re-enter Rome in a triumphal procession on the way to the two together re-conquering the world for Christ. The Doctrinal Discussions of 2009–2011 may have highlighted an absolute doctrinal divergence, but that merely proves that the arrangement needs to be purely practical (!).

Alas, priests allowing themselves to be lulled by any such dream have either not read *Pascendi* or not understood what they read. In his great Encyclical Letter of 1907 St Pius X warned that Modernism represented a major threat to the Church's existence, because Modernism is the end of the road in cutting off the soul from reality, natural or supernatural. It is the ultimate self-sealing of the mind within its God-less dreamland. Error can go no further. Here is an example of the self-sealing:—

Towards the end of the section on the Modernist theologian, *Pascendi* explains how the Modernist rejoices in being condemned by Church authority. Just as a

garden-hose must not be separated from the tap that enables it to water, so the Church must not be cut off from its source in Tradition. The Church needs then to progress by an inter-play between Modernism and Tradition. Therefore the Modernists need authority to be Traditional, and to do the Traditional thing by condemning them as Modernists. So if the Pope does not condemn them, they will forge ahead, and if he does condemn them they will go ahead anyway because by their very condemnation he is contributing to the progress of the Church! Heads he loses, tails they win. That is self-sealing error. God cannot win.

Well, the great and good God has a surprise in store for those who think so. To save souls he washed out men's whole wretched system in the time of Noah, and to save souls again he may this time round blast it clean. The blasting may or may not start in 2012. And the consoling quote? –

“When these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift your heads, because your redemption is at hand.” (Lk.XXI, 28). The hour is darkest, they say, just before dawn.

Kyrie eleison.

## STATE RELIGION – III

No. CCXXXV (235)

January 14, 2012

Three more objections to the doctrine that all States should be Catholic, are answered, not just by faith but by natural reason.

To claim that States need not profess or protect the Catholic religion is a classic liberal error, and one of the major errors of Vatican II. Liberalism said, so to speak, “Let us not attack Catholicism head on, but let us divide and rule. Let us divide the individual man from society by pretending that man is not a social animal, and then we can pretend that religion is purely an individual affair. This will enable us to take over society, and once we have made it liberal, we can turn it back on the individual as a mighty weapon to liberalize him too, because of course man is a social animal! If any individual then wants not to be liberal, he will have great difficulty in resisting his society that we have liberalized.” Not so? Look around! Then let us answer three more objections to the doctrine that, for the salvation of souls, every State should be Catholic.

*Your Excellency, Our Lord himself said, “Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s” (Mt. XXII, 21). Here Our Lord is clearly separating Church from State. Therefore no State should get involved in Catholicism or any other religion* Answer, no, Our Lord is not here separating Church from State! He is making the common sense distinction between what the individual owes to the State (taxes, etc.) and what he owes to God (worship). Our Lord is absolutely not saying that the temporal State owes nothing to the eternal God. In fact the State, as being the collective temporal authority of a collection of human beings, owes to God in its acts of authority what they owe to him as social beings, namely the social observance of his natural law, and to that Church which natural reason on its own can see to be true, as much social recognition and promotion as will not get in the way of the salvation of souls.

*But discerning which is the true religion is something for the individual to do. How then can the State as State be obliged in principle to be Catholic?* Answer, the State is nothing but the moral (i.e. non-material) association in a political body of a greater or lesser

number of physical (i.e. material) human beings. But every one of these human beings, merely by the upright use of his natural reason, whether or not he has the supernatural virtue of the Faith, is capable of discerning that God exists, that Jesus Christ is God, and that the Catholic Church is the one Church founded by Jesus Christ. If then any given State does not discern which is the true religion, that is not because its citizens cannot discern, but because for a variety of reasons they will not, or do not want to do so, by making an upright use of their God-given reason. In fact they can discern, and before God they will all bear a greater or lesser responsibility, perfectly measured by him according to their circumstances, for failing to do so.

*But, your Excellency, if you insist on every State's obligation to be Catholic, you are merely going to make a lot of martyrs for evil.* It is for the glory of God and the eternal salvation of souls that every State should be Catholic. To men therefore too ignorant or corrupt for this truth to do anything but alienate them, one may, without minimising the principle, hesitate to proclaim it, but that does not make it any less true. True principles are no less true for sometimes requiring in practice a measure of prudence in the way they are to be told. Surely readers of this "Commentary" can be told the whole truth!

Kyrie eleison.

## “MENTAL SICKNESS”

No. CCXXXVI (236)

*January 21, 2012*

With God’s grace, let us be neither schismatizing “sedevacantists,” nor – worse – like today’s Roman churchmen, who are sick in the head.

A long-standing correspondent wrote to me recently with a dozen arguments to show why the SSPX should come to some agreement with Rome, even if the doctrinal Discussions of 2009–2011 showed that the Rome-SSPX doctrinal disagreement is radical. Let me dwell here on one of his arguments, because I think it opens up the full dimensions of what the SSPX is up against.

He wrote that if the SSPX does not soon “normalize” its standing with Rome, then it runs the risk of losing the sense of what it means to belong to the Church. For there are layfolk and even SSPX priests who are comfortable with their present abnormal situation and have adapted to it, because the SSPX “has all that it needs, notably bishops.” Such adaptation, wrote my colleague, tends towards a schismatic mentality and a practical, if not theoretical, sedevacantism. I replied that in my opinion a much greater risk than that of acquiring a schismatic mentality is that of contracting “the spiritual and mental sickness of today’s Romans by getting too close to them.” A scandalous reply? Let me explain.

“Mental sickness” is the phrase applied to Roman churchmen with whom a second friend recently held long conversations. He said that they are intelligent and sincere men, fully capable of grasping the arguments of Tradition put before them, but he concluded, “They are mentally sick. Only, they have the authority.” Certainly he meant no personal insult to these Romans when he called them “mentally sick.” What he was uttering was something far more serious than a mere personal insult. He was commenting on the objective state of the Romans’ minds, as confirmed by his long conversations with them. Their minds are no longer running on truth.

A third friend also in contact with Romans said the same thing in different words. I asked him, “Could you not have gone to the root of the matter and opened up with them the basic question of the mind and truth?” He replied, “No. All they would have said was that they were the authority, that they were the Catholic Church, and if we

wanted to be Catholics, it was for them to tell us how.” Such minds are running not on truth but on authority. Now milk is a beautiful thing, but imagine a car-owner quite calmly insisting on filling his car’s gas-tank with milk! The gigantic problem is that almost the entire modern world has lost all sense and love of truth. For the longest time the Church resisted this loss of truth, but with Vatican II that last resistance also collapsed.

For indeed the modern world is glamorous and weighty, and so is Rome! Here is how an Italian friend senses the glamour of the Vatican offices: “To step into the Roman palaces is a daring enterprise because the very air you breathe within is irresistible. The fascination of these hallowed halls comes not so much from the charming officials (by no means all of them are charming) as from the sense the halls exude of the 2000-year duration of Church history. Is the fascination from Heaven? Is it from Hell? In any case the mere atmosphere of the Vatican seduces visitors and tames their wills.”

And the fascination of the Vatican is only a small part of the total pressure of the modern world seeping into minds to disable them, and to make us follow its current. Dear friend of mine, I would rather be a schismatic sedevacantist than a Roman apostate. With the grace of God, neither!

Kyrie eleison.

# MORE CHEERFUL

No. CCXXXVII (237)

January 28, 2012

If a soul understands how God prefers quality to quantity, it could almost wish the chaos of today's world were still worse.

*Your Excellency, please tell us something more cheerful!*

God exists. He is all-powerful, all-knowing, all-just, but his mercy is also boundless. He is in perfect control of all that is happening in the world. Neither the Devil nor his human servants, including the criminals now running the world, can lift a finger without his permission. He knows every detail of their diabolical plans and is using every single one of them to fulfil his own Providential design.

*But how then can he be allowing so much evil in our world? Because while he never wants evil, he wants to allow it, so as to bring out of it a greater good. Many prophecies indicate that out of today's global corruption will arise tomorrow the greatest triumph ever of the Catholic Church, e.g. Our Lady of Fatima; "In the end my Immaculate Heart will triumph." What is happening right now is that Our Lord is using his enemies to purify his Church.*

*But could he not have found a less unpleasant way of purifying his Church than for us to have us go through today's unbelievable corruption? If it depended only on him, undoubtedly he could have found other ways of purifying his Church, but if you and I knew all that he knows – foolish thought! – and if above all you and I wanted, as he does, to respect the free-will that he gives to all human beings, then there is every likelihood that you and I would see that the way he is choosing to do things is the best.*

*And just what does man's free-will have to do with it?*

God does not want robots or merely irrational animals to share with him in his bliss. Now even he cannot give to his creatures a deserved happiness which they have done nothing to deserve, because that is contradictory and his power is over all being, not over non-being such as things contradictory. But if creatures are at least in part to deserve his bliss, then he must give them free-will, which if it is to be for real, must be able to choose the opposite of what he wants for it, and if it is really able to choose evil, then that is what will happen, more or less often.

*But you say that the true Church follows Our Lord in teaching that narrow is the path to Heaven and few there be that find it (Mt. VII, 14). How can it be worth God's while to have created, just today for instance, a mass of human beings, if only relatively few reach Heaven? How can so many falling into the horrors of Hell not be too high a price to pay for the relatively few reaching Heaven? Because God works in quality, not in quantity. That a mere ten men could have saved from his wrath the whole city of Sodom (Gen. XVIII, 32) proves how precious to God is one single soul responding to his love, over a large number that by their own free choice do not want his love. "I would have gone through the whole Passion just for you," said Our Lord once to a soul. He would say it to any soul.*

*Do you mean that if, when the world worries and torments me, I merely stick all the more closely to God, then he takes account of it, for me and for those around me? I might almost want the world to be still worse! Now you are getting the idea!*

Kyrie eleison.



## DELINQUENT FINANCE – II

No. CCXXXVIII (238)

*February 4, 2012*

As God's enemies use finance to send souls down to Hell, so fractional reserve banking deserves to be further explained.

Delinquent finance has today a religious significance because it is playing a major part in the enslaving of the entire world by the conscious or unconscious enemies of God, the smartest of whom have to be well aware that their ultimate purpose is to send every single soul down to Hell. However, before we present any other piece of their financial machinery, it is necessary to understand the full delinquency of fractional reserve banking, first introduced in the "Eleison Comments" of October 29, last year.

Fractional reserve banking means that a bank need only hold in reserve, ready to be paid out to customers, a small fraction of the money they put into circulation. It arose in Europe in the late Middle Ages when bankers observed that if they took in as deposits, say, 100 ounces of gold and gave out 100 slips of paper certifying that the owner of the certificate could claim so much gold from the bank, then almost never at any one time would more than, say, ten customers ever bring in a certificate to claim back a deposit of gold. And as long as the people had confidence that the bank could and would always have gold to give in return for certificates, then these pieces of paper could happily serve as money, and as such they would circulate amongst the people.

However, the bankers realized meanwhile that in the normal run of business, they needed to hold in reserve only ten ounces of gold for 100 certificates, or, if they held 100 ounces of gold deposited with the bank, then they could issue 1000 paper certificates. Of these, 900 would have nothing at the bank to back them. They would be "funny money," created by the bank out of thin air, but that would not matter so long as not more than a proportion of one customer out of ten wanted to cash in his paper for a piece of gold.

If they did, then the bank would not have the gold for all the certificates, and either it rapidly borrowed some gold from elsewhere to hand out, or the people risked realizing what a confidence trick had been played on them. If their confidence in the bank then vanished, everybody would want their money back at once – bank runs are only made

possible by fractional reserve banking – and large numbers of customers would be left holding in their hands nothing but worthless pieces of paper. The bank would of course be bankrupt, and one could hope it would disappear altogether.

Thus wherever there is fractional reserve banking, the bank is intrinsically fragile, and it is, ultimately, playing a confidence trick on its customers. Extrinsically, it may protect itself by having a guarantee of support in case of need from, often, a central bank, but that guarantee is only as sure as the guarantor, and in the meantime it gives a dangerous power to any central bank. Thereby hangs another tale of financial delinquency, but that of compound interest must come first.

Power is at stake, and ultimately souls. Let nobody say these questions have nothing to do with religion. Think of the Golden Calf.

Kyrie eleison.

# DEADLY ANGELISM

No. CCXXXIX (239)

*February 11, 2012*

The 20th century's most outstanding poet in English, T.S.Eliot, sets an example of not pretending that modernity is angelic.

Discerning what made T.S.Eliot (1888–1965) “indisputably the greatest poet writing in English in the 20th century,” a conservative English writer of our own day, Roger Scruton, has some interesting things to suggest to Catholics hanging on to their Faith by their fingertips in these early years of the 21st century – briefly, in the pain is the solution! If we are being crucified by the world around us, that is the Cross we are meant to be carrying.

Eliot was in poetry an arch-modernist. As Scruton says, “He overthrew the 19th century in literature and inaugurated the age of free verse, alienation and experiment.” One may well question whether Eliot's final combination of high culture and Anglicanism is a sufficient solution to the problems he was tackling, but who can deny that with his famous poem, the “Waste Land” of 1922, he blazed the trail for contemporary English poetry? The enormous influence of his poems demonstrated at least that Eliot had his finger on the pulse of the times. He is a modern man, and he tackled head on the problem of modern times, summed up by Scruton as “fragmentation, heresy and unbelief.”

However, the “Waste Land” could not be the masterpiece that it is if it did not make some sense out of the chaos. It is in fact a brilliant portrait in a mere 434 lines of the shattered European “civilisation” that emerged from the ruins of World War I (1914–1918). And how did Eliot manage to do that? Because as Scruton says, Eliot the arch-modernist was also an arch-conservative. Eliot had soaked himself in the great poets of the past, notably Dante and Shakespeare, but also in more modern masters such as Baudelaire and Wagner, and it is clear from the “Waste Land” that it is Eliot's grasp of the order of the past that enabled him to get a handle on the disorder of the present.

Scruton comments that if then Eliot blew away the great romantic tradition of 19th century English poetry, it is because that romanticism no longer corresponded to the

reality of his age. “He believed that his contemporaries’ use of worn-out poetic diction and lilting rhythms betrayed a serious moral weakness: a failure to observe life as it really is, a failure to feel what must be felt towards the experience that is inescapably ours. And this failure is not confined, Eliot believed, to literature, but runs through the whole of modern life.” The search for a new literary idiom on Eliot’s part was therefore part of a larger search – “for the reality of modern experience.”

Now have we not seen, and do we not see, the same “serious moral weakness” inside the Church? One may call “Fiftiesism” that weakness of the Church of the 1950’s which was the direct father of the disaster of Vatican II in the 1960’s. What was it if not a refusal to look squarely at the modern world for what it is? A pretence that everything was nice, and everybody was nice? A pretence that if I just wrap myself up in an angelist sentimentality, then the problems of the Church in the Revolutionary world will just float away? And what is now the pretence that Rome really wants Catholic Tradition if not the same essential refusal of modern reality? As Eliot taught us that sentimentality is the death of true poetry, so Archbishop Lefebvre showed us that it is the death of true Catholicism. The arch-conservative Archbishop was the truest of modern Catholics.

Catholics, today’s reality may be crucifying us in any one of its many corrupt ways, but rejoice, again, says St Paul, rejoice, because in our own acceptance of our modern Cross today is our only salvation, and the only future for Catholicism

Kyrie eleison.

## ANGELISM – II

No. CCXL (240)

February 18, 2012

How can a modern artist like T.S.Eliot be praiseworthy? Because while facing modern man's disorder, he never gives up on God's order.

Alert readers of these "Comments" may have picked up on an apparent contradiction. On the one hand the "Comments" have repeatedly condemned anything modern in the arts (e.g. EC 114, 120, 144, 157, etc.). On the other hand last week the Anglo-American poet T.S.Eliot was called an "arch-modernist," and praised for launching a new style of poetry more true to modern times, certainly chaotic.

As the "Comments" have often said, modernity in the arts is characterized by disharmony and ugliness, because modern man chooses more and more to live without or against the God who has planted order and beauty throughout his creation. This beauty and order are now so buried beneath the pomps and works of godless man that it is easy for artists to believe they are no longer there. If then their art is to be true to what they perceive of their surroundings and society, only an exceptional modern artist will convey anything of the divine order underlying the disordered surface of modern life. Most modern artists have given up on order and, like their customers, wallow in the disorder.

But Eliot was born and reared in the late 19th century when society was still relatively ordered, and he received in the USA a good classical education when only a few secret villains yet dreamt of replacing education with training in inhuman subjects. So Eliot may have had little or no access in his youth to true religion, but he was well introduced to its by-products since the Middle Ages, the classics of Western music and literature. Sensing and seeking in them an order missing around him, Eliot was thus able to grasp the deep-down disorder of the rising 20th century, a disorder which merely burst out in the first World War (1914–1918). Hence the "Waste Land" of 1922.

But in that poem he is far from wallowing in the disorder. On the contrary he clearly hates it, showing how empty it is of human warmth and value. So the "Waste Land" may bear little trace of Western religion, but it does finish on scraps of Eastern

religion, and as Scruton says, Eliot was certainly tracking the religious depths of the problem. In fact a few years later Eliot nearly became a Catholic, but he was scared off by Pius XI's condemnation in 1926 of the "Action française," a condemnation in which he recognized more of the problem and not its solution. So out of gratitude to England for all it had given him of traditional order, he settled for a solution less than complete, combining Anglicanism with high culture, and a Rosary always in his pocket. However God does write straight with crooked lines. How many souls in search of order would have stayed away from Shakespeare or Eliot if they thought that either of them, by being fully Catholic, had answers only pre-fabricated, not true to life.

That is sad, but it is so. Now souls may well be deceiving themselves in one way or another if they shy away from Catholic authors or artists on the grounds that these are untrue to real life, but it is up to Catholics to give them no such excuse. Let us Catholics show by our example that we do not have minds made cosy by artificial solutions necessarily false to the depths of the modern problem. We are not angels, but earthy creatures invited to Heaven if we will pick up our modern cross and follow Our Lord Jesus Christ. Such followers can alone remake the Church, and the world!

Kyrie eleison.

# BENEDICT'S ECUMENISM I

No. CCXLI (241)

February 25, 2012

Several numbers of “Eleison Comments,” working from a recent book in German, will show the Pope’s concept of the Church is false.

A valuable study of conciliar ecumenism appeared in Germany a few years ago, written by a certain Dr. Wolfgang Schüler. In “Benedict XVI and How the Church Views Itself,” he argues that the ecumenism let loose by Vatican II transformed the Church’s understanding of itself, and he proves by a series of textual quotations that Joseph Ratzinger as priest, Cardinal and Pope has consistently promoted this transformation, from the time of the Council down to today. Nor can he be ashamed of having done so.

In logical order – it will take more than one “Eleison Comments” – let us look at the true Church’s view of itself, and then with the help of Dr Schüler, at how that view was changed by the Council and how Benedict XVI has consistently promoted that change. Finally let us draw the conclusions that emerge for Catholics wishing to keep the true Faith.

The true Catholic Church has always seen itself as an organic whole, a society one, holy, catholic and apostolic, consisting of human beings united by the Faith, the sacraments and the Roman hierarchy. This Church is so much one, that no piece can be broken off or taken away without its ceasing to be Catholic (cf. Jn. XV, 4–6). For instance, that Faith which is the prime constituent of the Catholic believer cannot be held piecemeal, but must be held either altogether (at least implicitly) or not at all. This is because it is on the authority of God revealing the dogmas of Catholic Faith that I believe them, so that if I disbelieve only one amongst many dogmas, I am rejecting his authority behind them all, in which case even if I believe all the other dogmas, my belief is resting no longer on God’s authority but only on my own choice.

In fact the word “heretic” comes from the Greek word for “to choose” (hairein), so because a heretic’s belief is henceforth merely his own choice, he has lost the supernatural virtue of faith, so that even if he rejects only one dogma of Faith, he is no longer Catholic. A famous quote of Augustine runs: “In much you are with me, in

little you are not with me, but because of that little in which you are not with me, the much in which you are with me is of no use to you.”

For instance a Protestant may believe in God, he may even believe in the divinity of the man Jesus of Nazareth, but if he does not believe in the Real Presence of God, body, blood, soul and divinity, beneath the appearances of bread and wine after their consecration at Mass, then he has a profoundly different and deficient concept of the love of Jesus Christ and of the God in whom he believes. Can one then say that the true Protestant and the true Catholic believe in the same God? Vatican II says one can, and on the basis of supposedly more or less shared beliefs between Catholics and all non-Catholics, it builds its ecumenism. On the contrary Dr Schüler illustrates by a series of comparisons that what may look like the same belief, when it forms part of two different creeds, is not really the same at all. Here is one illustration: oxygen molecules mixed with nitrogen are the selfsame molecules as when compounded with hydrogen, but they are as different in the two cases as the air we breathe ( $O + 4N$ ) from the water we drink ( $H_2O$ )! Stay tuned.

Kyrie eleison.



# GOOD NEWS

No. CCXLII (242)

*March 3, 2012*

In the author's appeal from two previous condemnations in Germany for "racial incitement," the case was dismissed on procedural grounds.

Many if not all of you readers will have heard by now of last week's good news from Germany: on Ash Wednesday the Appeals Court of Lower Bavaria in Nuremberg quashed the Regensburg Regional Court's condemnation of me on 11 July of last year for "racial incitement." Then I was condemned for having, in November of 2008, on German soil, in an interview to Swedish television, taken a politically incorrect view of certain historical events differing from the view commonly held, but now the Appeals Court has decreed in addition that the Bavarian State must pay my trial costs so far. All honour to my defence lawyer, Prof. Dr. Edgar Weiler, whose arguments the judges made their own, and to Fr. Schmidberger who introduced me to him, and to Bishop Fellay who approved of him.

However, I am not yet free and clear insofar as the Appeal judges made their decision on procedural grounds. Here is their conclusion: "If an indictment describes behaviour of the accused not punishable (as yet), and leaves open what concrete circumstances supposedly render him liable to punishment, then by not listing the inner and outer facts of the case the indictment is failing in its function, laid out above, of defining the action for which the accused is being put on trial. Case dismissed."

So in theory, the Regensburg Prosecutor's office could correct its procedure and start the prosecution all over again. However, in practice they may well hesitate, because the Appeal judges called on them to specify who exactly came to know of the remarks, by what means they came to know of them, how exactly those remarks were apt to disturb the peace in Germany and finally how I was supposed to have approved of the remarks being made known there.

Now the prosecution might easily show that the whole wide world, let alone Germany, was hammered for a month with the remarks by all the world's media (mainly in order to force Benedict XVI to distance himself from Catholic Tradition), but it would not be so easy to prove the disturbance of the peace in Germany. Also the

prosecutors would have real difficulty in proving that I wanted my remarks to be made public in Germany, given that in the last minute of the interview (accessible on Youtube) I expressly wished the contrary. So it is in God's hands whether the prosecution will continue, or not.

Meanwhile, dear readers, do not suppose that I have ever suffered too heavily from these trials in Germany, any more than I have needed to take too tragically my corresponding three-year exile within the SSPX. That exile has been if anything too comfortable, and these trials have ended, for the moment at least, in their complete termination. Let me then thank all of you that in the course of these three years have prayed for me. I know there are many of you, and I am grateful to every one of you. In return I celebrated in January a novena of Masses for your intentions, because surely much greater trials lie in wait for all of us.

Kyrie eleison.

# TURNING POINT

No. CCXLIII (243)

March 10, 2012

Before the Episcopal consecrations of 1988, Archbishop Lefebvre did work for a practical agreement with Rome, but thereafter, never again. Never again.

Speaking in the USA last month on Rome-SSPX relations, the Society of St Pius X's Superior General said that some practical agreement between the two might be possible if Rome would accept the SSPX as it is, and he quoted the Archbishop as having often said that such an arrangement would be acceptable. However, Bishop Fellay did add that the last time that the Archbishop said this was in 1987. This little addition is highly significant, and it deserves to be dwelt on, especially for a younger generation that may be unfamiliar with the historic drama of the Episcopal Consecrations of 1988.

In fact the drama of dramas, without which the SSPX would never even have come into existence, was the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965), at which the large majority of the world's Catholic bishops signed on to that “up-dating” of the Church by which they split their Catholic authority from the truth of Catholic Tradition. From that point on, Catholics had to choose between Authority and Truth. To this day, if they choose Authority, they must long for Truth, and if they choose Truth, they still yearn for union with Authority. Archbishop Lefebvre chose Truth, which is why he founded the SSPX in 1970 to defend it, but for as long as possible he did all in his power to heal its split with Authority by striving to obtain Rome's approval for his Society. That is why Bishop Fellay is right to say that until 1987 the Archbishop repeatedly wished and worked for some practical agreement with Rome.

However, by 1987 the Archbishop was 82 years old. He foresaw that without its own bishops, the SSPX's stand for Tradition must come to an end. It was becoming urgent to obtain from Rome at least one bishop, but Rome stalled, surely because it too was well aware that the SSPX without its own bishop would die a lingering death. The resolute stalling of then Cardinal Ratzinger in May of 1988 made it clear to the Archbishop that neo-modernist Rome had no intention of protecting or approving of Catholic Tradition. So the time for diplomacy was over, and he went ahead with the

Episcopal Consecrations. From then on, he said, it was to be doctrine or nothing. From then on the absolutely necessary prelude to any contacts between Rome and the SSPX, he said, would be Rome's profession of Faith in the great anti-liberal documents of Catholic Tradition, e.g. *Pascendi*, *Quanta Cura*, etc.

And that is why, as Bishop Fellay implied on February 2, never again until his death in 1991 was the great Archbishop heard to say that some practical agreement might be possible or desirable. Himself he had gone as far as he could to obtain from Authority the minimum requirements of Truth. He even once suggested that he had in May of 1988 gone too far. But from the Consecrations onwards he never wavered or compromised, and he urged his Society to take the same line.

Has the situation changed since then? Has Rome returned to the profession of the Faith of all time? One might think so when Bishop Fellay informs us in the same sermon that Rome has modified its harsh position of September 14, and declares itself now willing to accept the SSPX as is. But one need only recall Assisi III and the Newbeatification of John-Paul II to suspect that behind the Roman churchmen's new-found benevolence towards the SSPX lies in all likelihood a reliance on the euphoria of re-established and prolonged mutual contact to dilute, wash out and eventually dissolve the SSPX's so far obstinate resistance to their Newchurch. Alas.

"Our help is in the name of the Lord."

Kyrie eleison.

# AMERICAN SHAKESPEARE?

No. CCXLIV (244)

March 17, 2012

The American film-maker, John Ford, comes maybe as close as modern times can to that greatest of popular entertainers, William Shakespeare.

A number of people will find it absurd to compare anybody involved in modern cinema with one of the greatest poets and dramatists of all time, but St. Patrick's Day may be the right moment to commemorate a great son of Ireland, the American film-director John Ford (1895–1973), by pointing out a few similarities between his career and that of William Shakespeare (1564–1616). A John Ford may be as close as our poor modern age can get to producing a Shakespeare – let's see:—

To begin with, both men were highly successful popular entertainers. Shakespeare set out to write not English Literature but scripts for the Globe Theatre company, always in need of new plays to put on stage. Between 1592 and his exile from the London stage less than 20 years later, he wrote some 35 plays of all kinds: history plays, comedies, tragedies, romances. They were all popular, because Shakespeare was so involved in the Globe Theatre and so close to its audience. As for John Ford, to satisfy the insatiable demand of the American film-going public for new films, between 1917 and 1970 he directed, with a company of actors appearing repeatedly, over 140 films, which mix, like Shakespeare, comic and serious, high life and low life. Many of these films were great box-office hits, because Ford like Shakespeare knew his public.

Both men were highly successful because they were story-tellers, stories being the heart of popular entertainment. Both men grip their audiences and hold them in suspense – what happens next? And as story-tellers can have considerable influence, so both men helped to mould their nations' character. By his history plays acting as propaganda for the recently established Tudor dynasty, Shakespeare has permanently influenced Englishmen's view of themselves coming out of the Middle Ages. Ford likewise had a keen sense of American history (e.g. *The Last Hurrah*), and by creating the myth of the "Western" that fabricated America's "Wild West," he so defined the American national character as to have made people associate Americans with cowboys ever since.

Both men served a serious apprenticeship to their craft, Shakespeare on the boards of the Globe Theatre, Ford by spending several years as a cameraman before graduating to the direction of films. Shakespeare as a poet is an incomparable wordsmith, yet Ford's poetry might be his camera work. Film directors without number have watched his films to learn how to use the camera because Ford had an eye for the detailed composition of his pictures in movement, or "movies." When asked to name the film directors who most appealed to him, another famous film director, Orson Wells, replied, "I like the old masters, by which I mean John Ford, John Ford and John Ford." Yet another film-maker compared Ford's films for the "simplicity and strength" of their style to middle-period Beethoven!

Finally both men were Catholics. The deepest drama of Shakespeare's plays arises surely from his Catholic sense, necessarily disguised, of the tragedy of Merrie England's irreversible slide into apostasy. John Ford was the tenth of eleven children of two immigrants to the United States, both born in Catholic Ireland. No doubt the Faith of his ancestors enabled him to commemorate the relative innocence and decency of yesterday's America, with its womanly women, and its manly and upright heroes as typified in Ford's films by John Wayne. A king of modern cinema may never make it to the Pantheon of all-time greats alongside a Shakespeare, but John Ford was that modern king.

Thank you, Ireland, and America. Happy St. Patrick's Day to both of you!

Kyrie eleison.

# REPLY TO OPEN LETTER OF MGR.

## NICOLA BUX

No. CCXLV (245)

*March 24, 2012*

A friend of the Pope appeals to the SSPX to accept the Pope's offer of unity. Let the Pope rather consecrate Russia.

London, 22 March, 2012.

Monseigneur,

In an Open Letter of March 19, addressed to Bishop Fellay and to all priests of the Society of St Pius X, you appealed to us to accept the sincere and warm-hearted offer of reconciliation that Pope Benedict XVI is making to the SSPX for the healing of the long-standing rift between Rome and the SSPX. Let me as one of the SSPX priests that you addressed take upon myself to give you my opinion as to what might have been the answer of that "great churchman," Archbishop Lefebvre.

Your letter begins with an appeal for "every sacrifice in the name of unity." But there can be no true Catholic unity that is not grounded in the true Catholic Faith. The great Archbishop made every sacrifice for unity in the true doctrine of the Faith. Alas, the Doctrinal Discussions of 2009–2011 proved that the doctrinal rift between the Rome of Vatican II and the SSPX is as wide as ever.

To this rift you referred on March 19 as no more than "remaining perplexities, points to be deepened or detailed," but on March 16 Cardinal Levada was categorical that the position taken by Bishop Fellay on January 12 is "insufficient to overcome the doctrinal problems." Bishop Fellay once observed how the churchmen of Rome can differ among themselves, but be their unity what it may, in any case Faith sacrificed for unity would be a faithless unity.

Of course, as you remind us, the Church is an institution both divine and human. Of course the divine element cannot fail, so of course the Church cannot ultimately fail,

and the sun will rise again. But one may beg to differ when you say that the dawn is close at hand, because that true Faith which the SSPX upheld in the Discussions is not shining out from the Rome of Vatican II, where accordingly the SSPX could not be in safety. Nor could it bring light if itself it adopted the Conciliar darkness.

The sincerity of the Pope's wish to welcome back the SSPX into "full ecclesial communion," as shown in a series of gestures of real good will, is not in doubt, but "a common profession of faith" between the SSPX and believers in Vatican II is not possible, unless the SSPX were to desert that Faith which it defended in the Discussions. And when the SSPX cries "God forbid!" to any such desertion, far from its voice being stifled, it is heard all over the world, and it bears for the Church Catholic fruits which today are the exception rather than the rule.

Certainly, "this is the appropriate moment," certainly "the favourable time is come" for a solution to the agonizing problems of Church and world. However, it is that solution which the Heavenly Mother has long been calling for, and which depends upon the Holy Father alone. In fact when Our Lord put it in his Mother's hands, she said that no other solution would work, so that He could not let any other solution work without making his Mother into a liar! Inconceivable!

The solution has been known of for a long time, for how could Heaven possibly have left the world in such distress as that of the last 100 years without providing a remedy like that provided by the prophet Elisha for the leprosy of the Syrian General Naaman? Humanly speaking, bathing in the River Jordan seemed ridiculous, but nobody could say that it was not possible. It required merely some faith and humility. The pagan General gathered together enough faith and trust in the man of God to do what Heaven asked for, and of course he was cured instantaneously.

Let the Holy Father but gather together enough faith and trust in the promise of the Heavenly Mother! Let him but seize this "appropriate moment" before the entire global economy collapses in ruins, and before madmen succeed in launching the Third World War in the Middle East! Let him, we beg of him, we entreat him, save Church and world by merely doing what the Heavenly Mother asked for. It is not impossible. She would overcome all obstacles in his way. By doing what she asks for, he alone can now save us from unimaginable – and unnecessary – suffering.

And if he wishes for any support in prayer or action with which the humble SSPX could help him to consecrate Russia to her Immaculate Heart in union with all the



bishops of the world, whom the Heavenly Mother would rally, he knows that he could count first and foremost on the support of Bishop Fellay and the other three bishops of the SSPX, least among whom is

Your devoted servant in Christ, +Richard Williamson.

# GRAVE DANGER

No. CCXLVI (246)

*March 31, 2012*

Back in 1988 Archbishop Lefebvre warned clearly that any merely practical agreement with today's Rome would divide and destroy the SSPX.

The desire of certain priests within the Society of St Pius X to seek a practical agreement with the Church authorities without a doctrinal agreement seems to be a recurring temptation. For years Bishop Fellay as the Society's Superior General has refused the idea, but when he said in Winona on February 2 that Rome is willing to accept the Society as is, and that it is ready to satisfy "all the Society's requirements . . . on the practical level," it does look as though Rome is holding out the same temptation once more.

However, the latest news from Rome will be known to many of you: unless the Vatican is playing games with the SSPX, it announced last Friday, March 16, that it found Bishop Fellay's January reply to its Doctrinal Preamble of September 14 of last year "not sufficient to overcome the doctrinal problems which lie at the foundation of the rift between the Holy See and the SSPX." And the Vatican gave the SSPX one month in which to "clarify its position" and avoid "a rupture of painful and incalculable consequences."

But what if Rome were suddenly to cease requiring acceptance of the Council and the New Mass? What if Rome were suddenly to say, "Alright. We have thought about it. Come back into the Church as you ask. We will give you freedom to criticize the Council as much as you like, and freedom to celebrate the Tridentine Mass exclusively. But do come in!" It might be a very cunning move on the part of Rome, because how could the Society refuse such an offer without seeming inconsistent and downright ungrateful? Yet on pain of survival it would have to refuse. On pain of survival? Strong words. But here is a commentary of Archbishop Lefebvre on the matter.

On May 5, 1988, he signed with then Cardinal Ratzinger the protocol (provisional draft) of a practical Rome-Society agreement. On May 6 he took back his (provisional) signature. On June 13 he said, "With the May 5 Protocol we would soon

have been dead. We would not have lasted a year. As of now the Society is united, but with that Protocol we would have had to make contacts with them, there would have been division within the Society, everything would have been a cause of division” (emphasis added). “New vocations might have flowed our way because we were united with Rome, but such vocations would have tolerated no disagreement with Rome – which means division. As it is, vocations sift themselves before they reach us” (which is still true in Society seminaries).

And why such division? (Warring vocations would be merely one example amongst countless others). Clearly, because the May 5 Protocol would have meant a practical agreement resting upon a radical doctrinal disagreement between the religion of God and the religion of man. The Archbishop went on to say, “They are pulling us over to the Council . . . whereas on our side we are saving the Society and Tradition by carefully keeping our distance from them” (emphasis added). Then why did the Archbishop seek such an agreement in the first place? He continued, “We made an honest effort to keep Tradition going within the official Church. It turned out to be impossible. They have not changed, except for the worse.”

And have they changed since 1988? Many would think, only for yet worse.

Kyrie eleison.

## BENEDICT'S ECUMENISM – II

No. CCXLVII (247)

*April 7, 2012*

The Church is more like a living tree than a pile of golden coins, as Vatican II and Benedict XVI pretend it is.

As in any dispute involving the dreadful ambiguities of Vatican II, it might take long and scholarly articles to prove, or attempt to disprove, what Dr Wolfgang Schüler puts forward in his book of 2008 on “Benedict XVI and How the Church views Itself.” However, his main line of argument is clear enough, and it is well worth presenting to readers of “Eleison Comments,” to help them to see clear amidst much confusion. In this respect, comparisons have their limits, but they do help.

A whole can be composed of parts in two different ways, like a living tree, or like a pile of coins. Either the whole is primary and the parts are secondary, as with a tree, or the parts are primary and the whole is secondary, as with a pile of coins. The tree as a whole is primary because parts like branches may be cut off, but the tree continues to live its life as a tree and grows new branches, while the branches cut off lose their life and become something quite different, like a log or a chair. On the contrary each coin separated from its pile of coins remains exactly what it was in the pile, and if only enough coins are taken from the pile, it is the pile that perishes.

Now, is the Catholic Church, taken as a whole, more like the tree or the pile of coins? The Catholic Church is that special society of human beings who are united in that society by three things: the Faith, the sacraments and the hierarchy. To all three life is given by God himself. Faith is a supernatural virtue of the mind which God alone can give. The sacraments use material elements like water and oil, but what makes them sacraments is the supernatural grace they carry, that can only come from God. Likewise the hierarchy consists of natural human beings, but if these had no guidance from God, they could never succeed by themselves in leading souls towards Heaven.

Therefore the Catholic Church is much more like a living tree than like a pile of coins, even golden coins. For just as every living organism has within it a principle of life that gives it its existence and unity, so the Catholic Church has within it primarily God himself, secondarily his hierarchy, giving to it existence and unity. When what

was a part of the Church cuts itself off from the hierarchy by schism, or from the Faith by heresy, it ceases to be Catholic and becomes something else, like the schismatic Orthodox or heretical Protestants. True, Orthodox believers may have kept valid sacraments, but since they are no longer united with Christ's Vicar in Rome, nobody in his right mind calls them Catholic.

But now comes Vatican II. It changed the view of the Church, as it were, from that of a living tree or vine-plant (Our Lord's own comparison: Jn. XV, 1–6), to that of a pile of golden coins. From the desire to open the Church to the modern world, the Conciliar churchmen began by blurring the frontiers of the Church (L.G.8). That enabled them to pretend that there are elements of the Church outside the visible bounds of the Catholic Church (U.R.3), like gold coins separated from the heap. And since a gold coin remains a gold coin, then they could further pretend (U.R.3) that what were elements of salvation inside the Catholic Church remain such outside also. From which the natural conclusion drawn by countless souls is that I no longer need to be a Catholic in order to get to Heaven. This is the disaster of Conciliar ecumenism.

We must present these texts of Vatican II in a little more detail before we pass on to Pope Benedict's efforts to combine the ecumenism which divides the Church with the Catholic doctrine that unifies it.

Kyrie eleison.

# CONCILIAR AMBIGUITY

No. CCXLVIII (248)

*April 14, 2012*

A most important paragraph on Tradition from a Vatican II document shows how that Council was two-faced in the worst way.

Imagine a strong and well-armed foot-soldier who in hot pursuit of the enemy walks into a quicksand. That is what it is like for a brave Catholic armed with the truth who ventures to criticize the documents of Vatican II. They are a quicksand of ambiguity, which is what they were designed to be. Had the religion of man been openly promoted by them, the Council Fathers would have rejected them with horror. But the new religion was skilfully disguised by the documents being so drawn up that they are open to opposite interpretations. Let us take a clear and crucial example.

From section 8 of *Dei Verbum* comes a text on Tradition which John-Paul II used to condemn Archbishop Lefebvre in 1988: “A/ Tradition . . . comes from the Apostles and progresses in the Church with the help of the Holy Spirit. B/ There is a growth in insight into the realities and words that are passed on. This comes about in various ways. C/ It comes through the contemplation and study of believers who ponder these things in their hearts. D/ It comes from the intimate sense of spiritual realities which they experience. E/ And it comes from the preaching of those who have received, along with their right of succession to the apostolate, the sure charism of truth.”

Now true Catholic Tradition is radically objective. Just as common sense says that reality is objective, meaning that objects are what they are outside of us and independently of what any subject pretends that they are, so the true Church teaches that Catholic Tradition came from God, and is what he made it, so that no human being can in the least little bit change it. Here then would be the Catholic interpretation of the text just quoted: “A/ With the passage of time there is a progress in how Catholics grasp the unchanging truths of the Faith. B/ Catholics can see deeper into these truths, C/ by contemplating and studying them, D/ by penetrating more deeply into them, and E/ by the bishops preaching fresh aspects of the same truths.” This interpretation is perfectly Catholic because all the change is placed in the people who do indeed change down the ages, while no change is placed in the truths

revealed that make up the Deposit of Faith, or Tradition.

But see now how the same passage from *Dei Verbum* can be understood not objectively, but subjectively, making the content of the truths depend upon, and change with, the subjective Catholics: “A/ Catholic truth lives and grows with the passing of time, because B/ living Catholics have insights that past Catholics never had, as C/ they discover in their hearts, within themselves, newly grown truths, D/ the fruit of their inward spiritual experience. Also, E/ Catholic truth grows when bishops preach things unknown before, because bishops can tell no untruth (!).” (In other words, have the religion that makes you feel good, but make sure that you “pay, pray and obey” us modernists.)

Now here is the huge problem: if one accuses this text from *Dei Verbum* of promoting modernism, “conservative” Catholics (who conserve little but their faith in faithless churchmen) immediately reply that the real meaning of the text is the Traditional meaning first given above. However, when John-Paul II in *Ecclesia Dei Adflicta* used this text to condemn Archbishop Lefebvre, and therewith the Consecrations of 1988, obviously he can only have been taking the text in its modernist sense. Such actions speak far louder than words.

Dear readers, read the text itself again and again, and the two interpretations, until you grasp the diabolical ambiguity of that wretched Council.

Kyrie eleison.

## BENEDICT'S ECUMENISM – III

No. CCXLIX (249)

April 21, 2012

Three further quotes from Vatican II documents show how the Council's ambiguity is behind Benedict's false concept of the Church.

In these "Comments" two weeks ago was the promise to look at three quotes from Vatican II which have done much to dissolve the Church of Jesus Christ, which is the Catholic Church. And one week ago was the warning that the texts of Vatican II are ambiguous, so that they can always be made to look as though there is nothing wrong with them. But only one of their two possible meanings is innocent. The other meaning is deadly for the Catholic Church, as the last forty years have proved.

The first quote comes from *Lumen Gentium* #8. Here it is: "The one Church of Christ . . . constituted and organized in the world as a society, subsists in the Catholic Church, which is governed by Peter and the bishops in communion with him." Now what does that word "subsists" mean here? The ambiguity is that it can mean either that Christ's Church exists mainly and only in the Roman Catholic Church, which is what the Church always taught up to Vatican II, or it can mean that Christ's Church exists mainly but not only in the Catholic Church, in which case Christ's Church also exists partly outside the Catholic Church. This opens the door to the Conciliar ecumenism which breaks down the Catholic Church's dogmatic claim to be the exclusive ark of salvation: "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus."

The problem here is that it is also a dogma that the Church is one. At every Sunday Mass we hear or sing that we believe in the "one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church." Then how can Christ's Church be divided amongst several more or less churchlike communities? If the Church is one, it cannot be several. If it is several, it cannot be one. In his book on *Benedict XVI and How the Church Views Itself*, Dr. Wolfgang Schüller gives a series of quotes of Joseph Ratzinger to show how as a theologian he enthusiastically promoted the breaking down of the Catholic Church's exclusivity, but as a Cardinal and Pope he has struggled to maintain also the Church's oneness.

The second quote comes from *Unitatis Redintegratio* #3: "Very many of the significant elements and endowments which together go to build up and give life to the Church



itself, can exist outside the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church.” Now the obvious meaning of these words is that as gold coins build up a heap but can also be found as gold coins outside the heap, so Church elements listed by the Council such as “faith, hope, charity and other gifts of the Holy Spirit” can be recognized existing as such outside the Catholic Church. But Our Lord said that branches cut off his vine wither and die (Jn. XV, 6). What is his vine if not his Church?

The third quote draws the logical conclusion, just a little further in the same document (U.R.#3):” The churches and communities separated (from the Catholic Church) have been by no means deprived of significance and importance in the mystery of salvation. For the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation . . .” But as Archbishop Lefebvre said: “No community insofar as it is separated from the Catholic Church can enjoy the support of the Holy Ghost since its separation means resistance to the Holy Ghost. He can work directly only on souls, he can use directly only means, that show no sign of separation.”

Vatican II essentially misunderstood the Church. Let us next see with the help of Dr Schüler how Benedict XVI has applied both brake and accelerator to that misunderstanding.

Kyrie eleison.

# “ENLIGHTENMENT” DARKNESS

No. CCL (250)

April 28, 2012

Behind Vatican II was the false philosophy of the 18th century “Enlightenment.” This makes a Catholic agreement with Conciliar churchmen impossible.

Whether or not the Society of St Pius X finally decides to by-pass the doctrinal disagreement and to enter into a purely practical agreement with the authorities of the Conciliar Church in Rome, souls concerned for their eternal welfare must understand as fully as possible what is at stake. In this connection a friend of mine just sent me an admirable synthesis of the heart of the matter:—

“From 2009 to 2011 so-called “Doctrinal Discussions” took place between Vatican experts and four theologians of the SSPX. These discussions made clear just how firmly the Roman authorities are attached to the teachings of Vatican II. That Council attempted to reconcile Catholic doctrine with the concept of man as developed by the “Enlightenment” of the 18th century.

“Thus the Council declares that by reason of the dignity of his nature, the human person has the right to practise the religion of his choice. Accordingly society must protect religious liberty and organize the peaceful co-existence of the various religions. These are invited to take part in ecumenical dialogue, since they all possess their own part of truth.

“In effect, such principles deny that Christ is truly God, and they deny that his Revelation, the deposit of which is guarded by the Church, must be accepted by all men and all societies. Thus the doctrine of religious liberty, as expressed in the Conciliar document *Dignitatis Humanae* #2, contradicts the teachings of Gregory XVI in *Mirari Vos*, of Pius IX in *Quanta Cura*, of Leo XIII in *Immortale Dei* and of Pius XI in *Quas Primas*. The doctrine expressed in the Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium* #8, according to which divine Providence uses non-Catholic sects as means of salvation, contradicts the teachings of Pius IX in the *Syllabus*, of Leo XIII in *Satis Cognitum* and of Pius XI in *Mortalium Animos*.

“These novel doctrines which along with many others contradict the formal and

unanimous teachings of Popes before the Council, can only be qualified in the light of Catholic dogma as heretical.

“Therefore since the unity of the Church rests on the integrity of the Faith, it is clear that the SSPX cannot come to any agreement – be it only “practical” – with those who hold such doctrines.”

When my friend accuses the 18th century movement of intellectual emancipation known as the “Enlightenment” of being at the root of the churchmen’s 20th century collapse, he is making essentially the same point as Archbishop Lefebvre when he said to priests of his, half a year before he died in 1991: “The more one analyzes the documents of Vatican II . . . the more one realizes that what is at stake is . . . a wholesale perversion of the mind, a whole new philosophy based on modern philosophy, on subjectivism . . . It is a wholly different version of Revelation, of Faith, of philosophy . . . It is truly frightening.”

So how does one get one’s mind back in subjection to God’s reality? One way might be to get hold of the papal Encyclicals mentioned by my friend above, and study them. They were written for bishops, but Conciliar bishops are not reliable. Today’s laity must take in hand their own formation – and their own Rosary.

Kyrie eleison.

## BENEDICT'S ECUMENISM – IV

No. CCLI (251)

May 5, 2012

Benedict XVI strove for a false Newchurch, made broader than the true Catholic Church by a false ecumenism of co-existing beliefs.

The Catholic Church has always taught that it is Jesus Christ's one and only true Church, so that even if the mass of believers leave it, as will happen at the end of the world (cf. Lk.XVIII, 8), still it will not have lost its unity. Thus St Cyprian said that the unity of the Church arises from a divine foundation knit together by heavenly sacraments, and it "cannot be torn asunder by the force of contrary wills." Souls may fall away or tear themselves away, but the Church they leave behind remains one. On this view "Church unity" can only mean souls coming back one by one into the one true Church.

That is not Vatican II's view of the Church. By saying (*Lumen Gentium* #8) that Christ's Church "subsists in" the Catholic Church, the Council opened the door wide to distinguishing between the two, and to pretending that Christ's "true" Church is broader than the "narrow" Catholic Church. On this view there are pieces of Christ's true Church scattered outside the Catholic Church, whereupon "Church unity" means putting these pieces together again without individuals having to convert one by one. This was certainly the view of the brilliant young Council theologian, Fr. Joseph Ratzinger, as is shown by astonishing words of his from soon after the Council, quoted with references in Dr. Schüler's *Benedict XVI and the Church's View of Itself*, pp. 17–19. A brief summary highlights their drift:—

Wherever there is Bishop, Table and Word of God, there is "church." This true broad Christian communion has been gravely narrowed down over the centuries by Roman centralization, which drove the Protestants to break with Rome. The doctrinal differences should have been lived with. So return-to-the-fold ecumenism needs to be replaced with co-existence ecumenism. Churches must replace Church. Catholics must open up. Conversion will be only for the individual who wishes. Protestant errors are, virtually, Protestants' rights.

But where is the Faith in all this talk of Church and churches? Or doctrine?

Apparently nowhere. And what kind of unity can exist between souls that have beliefs as contradictory as those of Catholics (old-fashioned) and Protestants? It can only be a quite different unity from that of the pre-conciliar Church, and therefore quite a different Church. Indeed young Fr. Ratzinger was working towards the Newchurch. However, the Newchurch's unity became a problem. Firstly, the unity of the Church is a dogma. And secondly, as Cardinal and Pope, Joseph Ratzinger found himself having to defend Newchurch unity against even wilder Revolutionaries than himself (e.g. Fr. Leonard Boff), for whom the Newchurch "subsists" all over the place, in many different pieces.

So Schüler quotes the Cardinal arguing that the Church of Christ has its complete realization in the Catholic Church, but not so as to exclude its incomplete realization elsewhere (but then how is it one?). Similarly the identity of the Church of Christ with the Catholic Church is substantial but not exclusive (but how can identity be anything other than exclusive?) Again, the complete being of Christ's Church is in the Catholic Church, but it also has incomplete being elsewhere (but how can a being be complete if part of it is elsewhere?). And so on.

In brief, Benedict XVI's Newchurch includes elements both Catholic and non-Catholic. But even partly non-Catholic is not Catholic as a whole. Therefore Benedict's ecumenical Newchurch is, as such, not the Catholic Church.

Kyrie eleison.

# FAITH KILLERS

No. CCLII (252)

May 12, 2012

To the subjectivist Newchurch true Catholicism, being objective, is a standing reproach. As such, the Newchurch cannot help attacking it.

But if Rome offers the Society of St Pius X all that it wants, why should the SSPX still refuse? Apparently there are Catholics still believing that if a practical agreement fulfilled all the SSPX's practical demands, it should be accepted. So why not? Because the SSPX was brought into existence by Archbishop Lefebvre not for its own sake, but for the sake of the true Catholic Faith, endangered by Vatican II as it has never been endangered before. But let us see here why the Newchurch authorities will seek any practical agreement as much as the SSPX must refuse it.

The reason is because the Newchurch is subjectivist, and any merely practical agreement implies that subjectivism is true. According to the new Conciliar religion, dogmas of Faith are not objective truths but symbols that serve subjective needs (*Pascendi*, 11–13, 21). For instance if my psychological insecurity is calmed by the conviction that God became man, then for me the Incarnation is true, in the only sense of the word “true.” So if Traditionalists have their need of the old religion, then that is what is true for them, and one can even admire how they cling to their truth. But in justice they must agree to let us Romans have our Conciliar truth, and if they cannot make that concession, then they are insufferably arrogant and intolerant, and we cannot allow such divisiveness within our Church of Iuv.

Thus Neo-modernist Rome would be happy with any practical agreement by which the SSPX would even only implicitly renounce its radical claim to the universality and obligation of “its” truths. On the contrary the SSPX cannot be happy with any agreement that in an action speaking louder than words would deny the objectivity of “its” religion of 20 centuries. It is not “its” religion at all. To come to an agreement with subjectivists, I have to stop insisting on objectivity. To insist on objectivity, I cannot accept any terms at all proposed by subjectivists, unless they renounce their subjectivism.

These Romans are doing no such thing. Yet another proof of their crusading

insistence upon their new religion came in the form of their recent “Note on the conclusions of the canonical visit to the Institute of the Good Shepherd” in France. Readers will remember that this Institute was one of several founded after the Council to enable Traditional Catholicism to be practised under Roman authority. Rome can wait for a few years before closing in, to make sure that the poor fish is well on the hook, but then –

The “Note” requires that Vatican II and the 1992 Catechism of the Newchurch must be included in Institute studies. The Institute must insist on the “hermeneutic of renewal in continuity,” and it must stop treating the Tridentine rite of Mass as its “exclusive” rite of Mass. The Institute must enter into official diocesan life with a “spirit of communion.” In other words, the Traditional Institute must stop being so Traditional if it wants to belong to the Newchurch. What else did the Institute expect? To keep to Tradition, it would have to get back out from under the Newchurch’s authority. What chance is there of that? They wanted to be swallowed by the Conciliar monster. Now it is digesting them.

So why, in Heaven’s name, would it be any different with the SSPX? Rome’s temptation may be rejected this time round by the SSPX, but let us be under no illusions: the subjectivists will be back and back and back to get rid of that objective truth and objective Faith which constitute a standing rebuke to their criminal nonsense.

Kyrie eleison.

# BENEDICT'S ECUMENISM – V

No. CCLIII (253)

May 19, 2012

Four previous numbers of “Eleison Comments” (241, 247, 249 and 251) are summarized to show how they tie together.

Because of the need to break a long argument into several pieces, readers may have lost the thread of the several EC’s on “Benedict’s Ecumenism.” Let us sum up the argument so far:—

EC 241 established a few basics: the Catholic Church is an organic whole, amongst the beliefs of which if anyone picks and chooses, he is a “chooser,” or heretic. Moreover, if he takes with him a Catholic belief outside the Church, it will not remain the same, just as if oxygen is taken out of water by electrolysis, it ceases to be part of a liquid and turns into a gas. Conciliar ecumenism supposes that there are beliefs which non-Catholics share with Catholics, but in fact even “I believe in God” is liable to be quite different when it is incorporated in a Protestant or in a Catholic system of belief, or creed.

EC 247 used another comparison to illustrate how parts of the Catholic whole do not remain the same when they are taken out of that whole. Gold coins may remain identical gold coins when they are taken out of a heap of coins, but a branch cut off a living tree becomes something quite different, dead wood. The Church is more like the tree than like the coins, because Our Lord compared his Church to a vine-plant, in fact he said that any branch cut off it is thrown into the fire and burnt (Jn. XV, 6 – interestingly, no living branch is so fruitful as the vine-branch, no dead wood is so useless as vine-wood). So parts cut off from the Catholic Church do not remain Catholic, as ecumenism pretends.

EC 249 would show how Vatican II documents promote these false ideas of ecumenism, but EC 248 had to issue a preliminary warning that those documents are notorious for their ambiguity, So it gave the example of how *Dei Verbum* (#8) opened the door to the modernists’ false notion of “living Tradition” Then EC 249 presented three Council texts, crucial for the modernists’ ecumenism: *Lumen Gentium* #8, suggesting that Christ’s “true” Church reaches beyond the “narrow” Catholic Church,



and *Unitatis Redintegratio* (#3), suggesting firstly that the Church is built up of “elements” or parts that can be found the same inside or outside the Catholic Church (like coins in or out of a heap), and secondly, that these elements can therefore serve to save souls inside or outside the Catholic Church.

EC 251 came at last to the ecumenism of Benedict XVI in particular. Quotes of Fr. Joseph Ratzinger given by Dr. Schüler in his book *Benedict XVI and the Church's View of Itself*,” showed how the young theologian in the 1960's thought entirely along the lines of golden coins in or out of the heap. Later quotes indeed showed that the older Cardinal and Pope has continually tried to keep his balance between the Church as a heap of coins and the Church as an organic whole, but as Dr. Schüler argues, this very balancing act presupposes that half of him still believes in the Church as a heap of coins.

Unless readers demand textual quotes of Joseph Ratzinger to prove that these are not being twisted or taken out of context, the last EC in this series will conclude with an application of its lessons to the situation of Archbishop Lefebvre's Society of St Pius X. On the one hand the SSPX is part of the true Catholic whole, “one, holy, Catholic and apostolic.” On the other hand it had better avoid making itself part of the diseased Conciliar whole. As a healthy branch grafted onto the unhealthy Conciliar plant, it would necessarily catch the Conciliar disease. No way can a mere branch heal that disease.

Kyrie eleison.

# DOCTRINE UNDERMINED

No. CCLIV (254)

May 26, 2012

By pronouncing that Vatican II's notion of religious liberty is "very limited," Bishop Fellay undermined Catholic doctrine and the SSPX.

Entire books have been written on the subject of religious liberty as taught by Vatican II in its Declaration of 1965, *Dignitatis Humanae*. Yet the Revolutionary teaching of that document is clear: given the natural dignity of every individual human being, no State or social group or any human power may coerce or force any man or group of men to act, in private or in public, against their own religious beliefs, so long as public order is observed (*D.H.#2*).

On the contrary the Catholic Church always taught up until Vatican II that every State as such has the right and even duty to coerce its citizens from practising in public any of their false religions, i.e. all non-Catholic religions, so long as such coercion is helpful and not harmful to the salvation of souls. (For instance in 2012 freedom is so widely worshipped that any such coercion would scandalize the citizens of nearly all States and make them scorn, not appreciate, the Catholic religion. In that case, as the Church always used to teach, the State may abstain from using its right to coerce false religions.)

Now the precise point on which these two doctrines contradict one another may seem quite limited –whether or not a State may coerce the public practice of false religions – but the implications are enormous: is God the Lord or the servant of men? For if on the one hand man is a creature of God, and if he is social by nature (as is obvious from men's naturally coming together in all kinds of associations, notably the State), then society and the State are also creatures of God, and they owe it to him to serve him and his one true religion by coercing false religions at any rate in the public domain (which is the State's business), so long as that will help rather than hinder the salvation of souls.

On the other hand if human freedom is of such value that every individual must be left free to corrupt his fellow citizens by the public practice and proselytizing of any false religion he chooses (unless public order be disturbed), then false religions must

be left free to flourish in the public domain (e.g. Protestant sects in Latin America today). So the difference between false religions and the one true religion is less important than human dignity. So the true religion is not so important. So the worth of God compared with the worth of man is not so important. Thus Vatican II down-grades God as it up-grades man. Ultimately Vatican II is replacing the religion of God with the religion of man. No wonder Archbishop Lefebvre founded the Society of St Pius X to uphold the transcendent dignity and worth of God, of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in a world and Church gone mad, drunk on man's dignity.

But now comes a religious leader who pronounced in public earlier this month: "Many people have an understanding of the Council, which is a wrong understanding." Religious liberty, he said, "is used in so many ways. And looking closer, I really have the impression that not many know what really the Council says about it. The Council is presenting a religious liberty that is a very, very limited one: very limited . . ." Asked whether Vatican II itself, i.e. as a whole, belongs to Catholic Tradition, he replied, "I would hope so."

See for yourselves the interview, given in English and accessible on YouTube under the title, "Traditionalist leader talks about his movement, Rome." Can anybody be surprised if "his movement" is currently going through the gravest crisis of its 42 years of existence?

Kyrie eleison.

# FLOWERS SPEAK

No. CCLV (255)

*June 2, 2012*

It is not unjust for a soul's eternal fate to depend on its brief life on earth. God spoke to it constantly.

God is infinite Being, infinite Truth, infinite Goodness, infinitely just and infinitely merciful. So teaches his Church, and the idea is grand and beautiful, so I have no objection. But then I learn that his Church also teaches that for just one mortal sin the soul can be damned for all eternity to sufferings harsh and cruel beyond all imagination, and that is not so nice. I begin to object.

For instance, I was never consulted before my parents decided to bring me into existence, nor was I consulted on the terms of the contract, so to speak, of my existence. Had I been consulted I might well have objected to such an extreme alternative between unimaginable bliss and unimaginable torment as the Church teaches, both without end. I might have accepted a rather more moderate "contract," whereby in exchange for a shortened Heaven I would have faced the risk of only an abbreviated Hell, but I was not consulted. An endlessness of either seems to me to be out of all proportion to this brief life of mine on earth: 10, 20, 50 even 90 years are here today, gone tomorrow. All flesh is like grass – "In the morning man shall flourish . . . in the evening he shall fall, grow dry and wither" (Ps. LXXXIX, 6). Along this line of thought God seems so unjust that I seriously wonder if he really exists.

The problem obliges us to reflect. Let us suppose that God does exist; that he is as just as his Church says he is; that it is unjust to impose upon anybody a heavy burden without that person's consent; that this life is brief, a mere puff of smoke compared with what eternity must be; that nobody can be in justice due for a terrible punishment if he has not been aware of committing a terrible crime. Then how can the supposed God be just? If he is just, then logically every soul reaching the age of reason must live long enough at least to know the choice for eternity that it is making, and the import of that choice. Yet how is that possible for instance in today's world, where God is so universally neglected and unknown in the life of individuals, families and States?

The answer can only be that God comes before individuals, families and States, and that he “speaks” within every soul, prior to all human beings and independently of them all, so that even a soul whose religious education has been null and void is still aware that it is making a choice each day of its life, that it alone is making that choice for itself, and that the choice has enormous consequences. But once again, how is that possible, given the godlessness of a world all around us like ours today?

Because the “speaking” of God to souls is far deeper, more constant, more present and more appealing than the speaking of any human being or beings can ever be. He alone created our soul. He will continue to be creating it for every moment of its never ending existence. He is therefore closer to it at every single moment than even its parents who merely put together its body – out of material elements being sustained in existence by God alone. And the goodness of God is similarly behind and within and underneath every good thing that the soul will ever enjoy in this life, and the soul is deep down aware that all these good things are mere spin-offs from the infinite goodness of God. “Be quiet,” said St. Ignatius of Loyola to a tiny flower, “I know who you are speaking of.” The smile of a little child, the daily splendor of Nature at all times of day, music, every sky a masterpiece of art and so on – even loved with a deep love, these things tell the soul that there is something much more, or – Someone.

“In thee, O God, have I hoped, let me never be confounded” (Ps. XXX, 2).

Kyrie eleison.

# ARCHBISHOP SPEAKS

No. CCLVI (256)

June 9, 2012

A letter of Archbishop Lefebvre after he consecrated bishops shows what drastic measures he considered necessary to defend the Faith.

Until Archbishop Lefebvre finally decided to consecrate bishops for the Society of St Pius X in June of 1988, he was, like all Catholics since Vatican II, torn between the Catholic Truth and Catholic Authority that that Council, following the modern world, had split from one another. However, once he had taken that decision, which proved clearly to have been the saving of Catholic Tradition, it was as though everything in his mind dropped back into place, and he never again wavered until his death some two and a half years later.

As an example of his clear mind, here is a letter that he wrote on August 18, 1988, to Dom Thomas Aquinas, the young Prior of the monastery in Brazil which had been founded from the Traditional Benedictine monastery in the south of France, le Barroux, under Dom Gérard. Alas, within days of the consecrations in Écône, Dom Gérard had broken with the SSPX in order to integrate his monastery into the Conciliar Church. Here is what the Archbishop wrote to Dom Thomas:—

*“How I regret that you had to leave before the events of le Barroux (i.e. Dom Gérard’s defection). It would have been easier to consider the situation resulting from Dom Gérard’s disastrous decision.*

“In his declaration he lays out what has been granted to him, and he accepts to put himself under obedience to modernist Rome which remains fundamentally anti-Traditional. That is what made me keep my distance. At the same time he wished to retain the friendship and support of Traditionalists, which is inconceivable. He accuses us of resisting for the sake of resisting. I did warn him, but his decision had already long been taken, and he did not want to heed our advice.

“The consequences are now inevitable. But we will have no further relations with le Barroux, and we are advising our faithful to give no more support to an operation which is henceforth in the hands of our enemies, the enemies of Our Lord Jesus

Christ and of his Universal Kingship. The Benedictine Sisters(attached to le Barroux) are in great distress. They came to see me. I gave to them the advice that I give to you: remain free, and reject any tie with this modernist Rome.

“Dom Gérard is using every argument to paralyze the resistance. ( . . . ) Fr. Tam will tell you what I have not written down here. ( . . . ) May God bless you and your monastery. Mons Marcel Lefebvre.” Subsequently Dom Gérard visited the monastery in Brazil to make it follow him into the Newchurch, but young Dom Thomas bravely stood his ground, and the monastery under his guidance has remained Traditional ever since. What does not appear in the letter above is that the Archbishop actually encouraged Dom Thomas to rally the faithful monks in le Barroux, and eject Dom Gérard!

Such was the Archbishop’s clear mind and will from the Episcopal consecrations onwards. One wonders how some of his sons can now be wanting to put themselves “*under obedience to modernist Rome which remains fundamentally anti-Traditional*,” or, under a subjectivist Pope who has no possible understanding of objective Catholic Tradition. Such is the power of seduction, increasing all the time, of the subjectivist world around us. The madness of subjectivism has become so normal, so widespread, that few people notice it any longer. “Our help is in the name of the Lord.”

Kyrie eleison.

# TODAY'S GALATIANS

No. CCLVII (257)

June 16, 2012

Strong words of St Paul castigating the Galatians for back-sliding are easily applied to Newsociety leaders flirting with Conciliar Rome.

“O you senseless Galatians,” cries out St Paul (Gal.III, 1), tearing a strip off one of his beloved flocks that was back-sliding, or wanting to go back from the New Testament to the Old Testament so as to satisfy Judaizers that would make them serve again “under the elements of the world” (IV, 3). It is remarkably easy to apply the Apostle’s tirade to the Traditional Catholics who are presently being tempted to slide back under Conciliar authorities so as to satisfy *Nostra Aetate*. But then it is the same world, flesh and devil, so with apologies to St Paul, let me adapt some verses from the Epistle to our own times:—

*“O you senseless Tradcats! Who has bewitched you, that you should not follow the Tradition of Our Lord Jesus Christ, as it has been set before you? This only would I learn of you: have you been leading Catholic lives for several years thanks to Vatican II, or thanks to Catholic Tradition? Are you so foolish that having experienced the fruits of Tradition you now want to give it up by putting yourselves back under the Conciliar authorities? Were all those fruits in vain(III, 1–4)?*

“I am astonished that you are so soon drifting away from the line of Archbishop Lefebvre who called you into the grace of Christ, and instead towards the new gospel of Vatican II, which is no gospel at all, but these modernists are troubling you, and they want to pervert the Gospel of Christ. But if ourselves or an angel from Heaven were to try to tell you that the Council was not really that bad, throw him out and don’t listen! Let me say it again: anyone pretending that the Archbishop would have been in favour of a deal today with Conciliar Rome should be thrown out! Whose interests are we seeking? Are we trying to please the Romans or to please God? If these Romans liked me, I would be no servant of Christ!(I, 6–10).

“Before you came to Tradition you were serving under churchmen who were turning the Church over to the world. But now, after you found Tradition, how can you be wanting to go back with the world, under the Conciliar authorities(IV, 8,9)? Am I



become an enemy of the SSPX because I tell the truth? Those misleading you pretend to be looking after your interests, but they want you to forget about the Archbishop so as to serve their own interests(IV, 16,17). Stand fast, and do not come under the sway of the Council again(V, 1). You were doing well. How can you now be letting yourselves turned away from the Truth? Whoever is doing this to you is no servant of God! I do believe you will come to your senses, but whoever is misleading you bears a grave responsibility. Do you think I would be so persecuted if I was preaching the world? Whoever is corrupting Tradition needs the knife for more than just circumcision(V, 7–12)!

“Those wanting the SSPX to go through Vatican II B are merely trying to avoid being persecuted for the Cross of Christ. They want you to be worldly, keeping only the outward appearances of Tradition. They want back in with the Judaizers in Rome, but God forbid that I should want anything other than the Cross of Our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified to me and I to the world. Whoever follows Tradition in this way, peace be to them, and mercy(VI, 12–16).”

Now read St Paul’s own Epistle. Let nobody pretend that the Word of God no longer applies!

Kyrie eleison.

# FLOWERS TEACH

No. CCLVIII (258)

*June 23, 2012*

All the beauties of Creation teach the value of time and why no soul at death can plead, “I did not know . . .”

If flowers speak (cf. EC 255), then they can also teach: the value of time, the justice of God, the harmony of grace and nature.

For instance, if God exists and he is not unjust by making a soul’s whole eternity depend upon its choices made during one brief life, even lasting 90 years, then it stands to reason both that every moment of that life counts, and that in every moment (even if not always with the same force) God is appealing to us to join him for eternity. That is why it makes sense that he should be talking through the flowers and through every other gift of his creation, because what soul alive can truthfully say that it has nothing and nobody to love? Even the most rabid “atheist” has, say, his dog or his cigarettes. And Who designed dogs and tobacco plants, and kept them reproducing down to our own day?

So just before he dies the “atheist” may still claim that he at least was never spoken to by God, but in the instant after he dies he will grasp in a flash that for every moment of his waking life God has been appealing to him through some creature or other around him. “Am I now unjust,” God might ask him, “if I condemn you for every remaining moment of my life, when for every moment of your life you have been refusing me? Have what you have chosen. Depart from me into . . .” (Mt. XXV, 41).

Conversely, take a soul that has profited by every moment of its life to love the great and good God behind all the good things it has enjoyed, and that has even recognized the permission of his Providence behind all the bad things it has not enjoyed. Then who needs to be recognized, or famous, who needs to appear in the media, or to fill drawers of vacation photographs, in order to give meaning to his life? Small wonder that in past ages talented souls could bury their talents in a cloister or monastery in order to devote them wholly to the loving of God. For indeed every moment of our time is of measureless value, because upon every moment hangs for good or ill a measureless eternity.

Moreover, that flowers speak can help us to make sense of another well-known problem: how can non-Catholic souls be condemned for not having the Catholic faith when Catholic missionaries never reached them? Whatever mystery is here may at least partly be solved, humanly speaking, if one recalls that it is the selfsame God who creates flowers and instituted the Catholic Church. Thus if God's Providence never allowed for Catholic truth to reach the ears of a given soul, nevertheless that soul will not be able to plead that it knew nothing of the true God, and it can be judged on what it did know, for instance the beauty of cloudscapes, of sunrises and sunsets. Did it, beholding them, say with the pagan Job (Job XIX, 25), "I know that my Redeemer liveth," or did it say, "Well, yes, that's nice, but now let me visit my neighbour's wife . . ."?

In fact a number of complaints that men have today against their Creator arise even with Catholics, because many Catholics are, like everybody else today, more or less cut off from Nature by their urban or suburban lives, and their "spirituality" becomes correspondingly artificial. "Woe to anybody who has never loved an animal," somebody has said. Children are close to God. Watch how naturally children love animals.

Great and good God, grant us to see you where you are, deep down everything and everybody, at every moment.

Kyrie eleison.

## TWO ERRORS

No. CCLIX (259)

*June 30, 2012*

Two bad arguments for the SSPX to join the Newchurch are refuted: one from graces of state, the other from Newrome's distress.

Whether or not the Society of St Pius X survives its present severe trial, liberals will keep coming back with false arguments to persuade it to commit suicide. Let us look at two more of them.

The first has come up constantly in recent debates over whether the SSPX should accept some practical (non-doctrinal) agreement with Conciliar Rome. It is simple: a Catholic leader (or leaders) has graces of state from God, therefore he should not be criticized but automatically trusted. Answer: of course God is offering to every one of us at all times, and not only to leaders, the natural assistance and/or supernatural grace we all need to begin fulfilling our duty of state, but we have free-will to co-operate with that grace or to refuse it. If all Church leaders always co-operated with their graces of state, how could there ever have been Judas Iscariot? And how could we ever have had Vatican II? The argument from graces of state is as foolish as it is simple.

The second argument is more serious. It was put forward last month in a ten-page article by a Mr. J.L. in a conservative Catholic periodical in England. It favoured a Rome-SSPX practical agreement. Here it is, abbreviated of course, but not distorted. The Catholic Church is today under heavy attack, from without (e.g. by the USA government) and from within (e.g. by bishops who love the good life but do not know their theology), and at the topmost level by a Vatican administration riddled with scandals and in-fighting. The Pope is besieged on all sides, and he is looking to the SSPX for help to re-establish within the Church the sane influence of the Church's past, in which he believes, even if he also believes in Vatican II. Monsignor Bux gave voice to the Pope's appeal: if only the SSPX would respond by accepting a practical agreement, it would immensely benefit not only the whole Church but also the SSPX itself. Fr Aulagnier, a former high-up SSPX priest, clearly sees as much.

Dear J.L., full marks for your love of the Church and recognition of its problems, for your concern for the Pope and your desire to help him, but low marks for your grasp

of where those problems come from and of what the SSPX is all about. Like one zillion souls in today's Church and world, including Fr. Aulagnier, you miss the absolutely basic importance of the doctrine of the Faith.

The USA government attacks because the Church is weak. The Church is weak because the bishops' poor behavior follows on their poor grasp of the doctrine of Heaven, Hell, sin, damnation, redemption, saving grace and the Redeemer's ever-present sacrifice in the true Mass. The bishops have such a poor grasp of these world-saving truths because, amongst other things, the Bishop of bishops only half believes them. The Pope only half believes them because the other half of him believes in Vatican II. Vatican II undermines all the true religion of God by the deadly ambiguities planted throughout its documents (as you recognize), and designed to put man in the place of God.

Dear J.L., false doctrine is the basic problem. By the grace of God the SSPX has up till now upheld Jesus Christ's true teachings, but if it put itself under Church authorities only half-believing them at best, it would soon stop attacking error (as is already happening), and it would finish by promoting error, and with error all the horrors you mention. God forbid!

Kyrie eleison.

## VATICAN II-B

No. CCLX (260)

*July 7, 2012*

The parallels between the official Church being seduced at Vatican II and the SSPX being seduced by the Newchurch, are striking.

The parallels between Vatican II and the recent happenings within the Society of St Pius X are so striking that these happenings could be called Vatican IIB. It stands to reason. Exactly the same seduction and pressure of the modern world that made the mainstream churchmen collapse in the 1960's have swayed a number of SSPX members in the 2000's, bringing the SSPX to near collapse. I recently imagined I heard a mother telling her child a bed-time story:—

“Once upon a time there was a flourishing Catholic Church, but it was surrounded by a naughty modern world. So the Church condemned the modern principles on which that world was based. But that world did not like being condemned, so it did all it could to infiltrate the Church and stop its condemnations. However, events like two dreadful World Wars were proving the Church to be right, and so souls were joining the Church in large numbers because it was providing true solutions to the world's problems.

“But then disaster struck! Just when so many souls were surrendering to the sweet yoke of Christ, the leading churchmen decided that the modern world was right after all, and so at a great four-year meeting in Rome they changed the Church's principles to fit the modern world. They made friends with all the Church's former enemies, and were very cruel towards the Church's true friends that wanted nothing to do with the modernization. These true friends were only a small minority of Catholics, because over several centuries Catholics had come to put so much trust in their leaders that even when these were betraying the Church, still the Catholics put their trust in them. However God in his mercy at last gave his true friends a leader of their own, a truly Catholic Archbishop, and then they began to rally, and a truly Catholic movement of resistance began to flourish.

“However, the movement was surrounded by the naughty Newchurch whose Newchurchmen did not like being condemned as modernists by the movement. So

they did all in their power to shut it down. But events such as the emptying out and shutting down of one Newchurch institution after another were proving the movement to be right, and so more and more Catholic souls were making their way towards the movement because of its true solutions to the problems otherwise insoluble, both of the modern world and of the Newchurch which had gone over to that world.

“But then disaster struck! Just when the movement was gaining more and more souls from the collapsing Newchurch, the leaders of the movement began to say that the ills of the modern world can be exaggerated, so the four-year meeting was not so bad after all. These leaders then began to make friends with the Newchurchmen, and they showed great harshness towards any members of the movement who might insist on condemning the Newchurch and its false principles. Worse, these leaders were not without followers inside the movement, because Catholics are so used to thinking they are disloyal if they do not trust their leaders.”

“Ooh, Mummy, did the story end happily ever after?”

“Darling, I can’t tell you. It’s not yet over. Now go to sleep.”

Kyrie eleison.

## BENEDICT'S ECUMENISM – VI

No. CCLXI (261)

*July 14, 2012*

Three direct quotes of Archbishop Lefebvre show how the SSPX joining the Newchurch would not convert it, but be converted by it.

It was promised that in the last of this series of “Eleison Comments” articles inspired by Dr Wolfgang Schüler’s book on “Benedict XVI and the Church’s View of Itself” its main lesson would be applied to the present situation of the Society of St Pius X. The application has already been suggested: if one can only be Catholic by belonging to the living organism of the Catholic Church, then one will become Conciliar by belonging to the organism of the Conciliar Church.

Benedict XVI holds that Catholic pieces cut off from the Catholic Church still belong to the Church of Christ. Dr Schüler, following Our Lord (Jn. XV, 1–7), argues on the contrary that the Church being a living organism, then branches cut off it wither and die, because it is the plant that gives them its life. It follows that if the SSPX is grafted onto the Conciliar plant which is wholly diseased with the Vatican II religion of man, then the Conciliar plant will transmit its disease to the SSPX. Here are three quotes of Archbishop which express this reality:—

In 1984, well before the Episcopal consecrations of 1988, he condemned in advance the illusion that the SSPX, by “getting back inside the Church would be able to fight, to do this, to do that.” He replied, “That is absolutely untrue. You don’t get back inside a structure, putting yourself beneath its superiors, and expect that once inside you are going to turn everything upside down. The reality is that they have everything they need to strangle us. They have all the authority.”

In 1988, just before the consecrations, he said, “Rome wants everything to go Vatican II, while they leave us a little bit of Tradition. ( . . . ) They are not changing their position. We cannot put ourselves in the hands of those people. We would be fooling ourselves. We do not mean to let ourselves be eaten up. ( . . . ) Little by little Tradition would be compromised.”

In 1989, soon after the consecrations, he answered the objection that the SSPX would



have done more good for the Church by staying inside than by getting itself put outside. He replied, "What Church are we talking about? If you mean the Conciliar Church, then we who have struggled against the Council for 40 years because we want the Catholic Church, we would have to re-enter this Conciliar Church in order, supposedly, to make it Catholic. That is a complete illusion. It is not the subjects that make the superiors, it is the superiors that make the subjects. Amidst the whole Roman Curia, amidst all the world's bishops who are progressives, I would have been completely swamped. I would have been able to do nothing."

In conclusion, if by any practical agreement or canonical regularization the SSPX were to put itself under the Conciliar authorities of the Church that are still firmly attached to the ideas of Vatican II, as the Doctrinal Discussions of 2009–2011 amply proved, then its defence of the true Faith would be "strangled, eaten up, swamped." Grafted into the living Conciliar whole, it could not help receiving from it the diseased Conciliar life. God forbid!

Kyrie eleison.

# RESISTANCE UNDERMINED

No. CCLXII (262)

*July 21, 2012*

A bishop's gravely erroneous sayings cast in doubt whether July's General Chapter granted the SSPX anything more than just a reprieve.

The good news from the General Chapter of the Society of St Pius X which closed on Saturday is that the SSPX, led to the brink of suicide, has been given a reprieve by the Chapter. However, if the following words, spoken in an interview broadcast worldwide, are any indication of the mind of the leaders still in place for another six years, prayers must still go up for the reprieve to last. Here are the words (which may or may not still be accessible on the Internet – see Catholic News Service):—

“Many people have an understanding of the Council(Vatican II) which is a wrong understanding, and now we have people in Rome who say it. We may say, in the Discussions(between Rome and the Society of St Pius X, from 2009 to 2011), I think, we see that many things which we(in the SSPX) would have condemned as coming from the Council are in fact not from the Council, but from the common understanding of it.”

To comment, we must go back to Vatican II. Containing both truth and error, its 16 documents are profoundly ambiguous and contradictory. Following Archbishop Lefebvre, the SSPX has never said that the documents contain no truth, but it has always accused them of containing serious errors, for instance the doctrine that the State has no right to repress non-Catholic religions. Conciliar Rome has always defended the documents, for instance by referring to the opposite truths contained in them, such as that every man must in matters religious find out and profess the truth. But the truths have never been the problem. The problem is the error and the contradiction. For instance, if a mass of individuals, such as the State, may be neutral in religion, why should the single individual not be? The contradiction opens the door wide to the liberation of man from God – liberalism.

The Doctrinal Discussions of 2009 to 2011 were set up to examine the doctrinal clash between the Romans' Conciliar subjectivism and the SSPX's Catholic objectivism. They showed, of course, that the clash is profound and irreconcilable, not between

Conciliar truth and Catholic truth, but between Conciliar error and Catholic truth, in effect between the religion of man and the religion of God.

Now comes the speaker to state that the “people in Rome” are right, and that “we” are wrong, i.e. the SSPX, because “many things” the SSPX has constantly condemned as coming from the Council come only from a “common understanding” of the Council. In other words, the Archbishop and his Society were wrong from the beginning to accuse the Council, and accordingly to resist Conciliar Rome. It follows that the episcopal consecrations of 1988 must have been an unnecessary decision, because Conciliar bishops could have been trusted to look after Catholic Tradition. Yet the Archbishop called those consecrations “Operation Survival,” and he called trusting Conciliar Rome “Operation Suicide.”

Today the speaker – consistently with his words quoted above – is certainly favouring a Rome-SSPX agreement. Moreover he is quoted as suggesting in Austria two months ago that this agreement would entrust Conciliar Rome with choosing the SSPX’s future bishops. Then unless Rome has stopped being Conciliar since the Archbishop’s day, and all the evidence cries out against such an illusion, the Archbishop would have said that the speaker was promoting “Operation Suicide” of the SSPX – unless the speaker has since disowned these words.

Kyrie eleison.

# CONCILIAR INFECTION

No. CCLXIII (263)

*July 28, 2012*

As a true Mass in false surroundings should be avoided, so should a faithful SSPX tying itself into an unfaithful Newchurch.

May Catholics who wish to keep the Faith attend a Tridentine Mass celebrated by a priest who is part of the Conciliar Church, for instance by his belonging to the Institute of Christ the King or to the Fraternity of St Peter? The answer has to be that, as a rule, a Catholic may not attend such a Mass, even if it is a Tridentine Mass, and even if it is worthily celebrated. What can be the justification for such a seemingly strict rule?

The basic reason is that the Catholic Faith is more important than the Mass. For if through no fault of my own even for a long time I cannot attend Mass but I keep the Faith, then I can still save my soul, whereas if I lose the Faith but for whatever reason go on attending Mass, I cannot save my soul (“Without faith it is impossible to please God” – Heb. XI, 6). Thus I attend Mass in order to live my Faith, and, belief going with worship, I attend the true Mass in order to keep the true Faith. I do not keep the Faith in order to attend Mass.

It follows that if the celebration of a Tridentine Mass is surrounded by circumstances that threaten to undermine my faith, then depending on the gravity of the threat, I may not attend such a Mass. That is why Masses celebrated by schismatic Orthodox priests may be valid, but the Church in her right mind used to forbid Catholics to attend on pain of grave sin, because, belief and worship going together, the non-Catholic worship threatened the Catholics’ faith. Now Orthodoxy has in the course of centuries caused huge harm to the Catholic Church, but can anything compare with the devastation wrought upon that Church within mere tens of years by Conciliarism? If then Catholics were forbidden to attend Mass in Orthodox circumstances, would not the same Church in her right mind forbid to attend a Tridentine Mass celebrated in Conciliar circumstances?

Then what is meant by Conciliar circumstances? The answer must be, any circumstances which, over a shorter or longer period of time, are going to make me

think that the Second Vatican Council was not an utter disaster for the Church. Such a circumstance might be a charming and believing priest who has no problem with celebrating either the new or the old Mass, and who preaches and acts as though the Council presents no serious problem. Conciliarism is so dangerous because it can so be made to seem Catholic that I can lose the Faith without – or almost without – realizing it.

Of course common sense will take into account a variety of special circumstances. For instance a good priest trapped for now within the Conciliar church may need encouragement to start on his way out of it by my attending his first celebrations of the true Mass. But the general rule must remain that I can have nothing to do with even the true Mass being celebrated in a Conciliar context. For confirmation, notice how Rome began by allowing the Institute of the Good Shepherd to celebrate exclusively the true Mass, because Rome knew that once the Institute had swallowed the official hook, eventually Rome could be sure of pulling the Institute into their Conciliar net. Sure enough. It took only five years.

That is the danger of any practical agreement without a doctrinal agreement between Rome and the Society of St Pius X. So long as Rome believes in its Conciliar doctrine, it is bound to use any such agreement to pull the SSPX in the direction of the Council, and the context of every SSPX Mass would become Conciliar, if not rapidly, at least in the long run. Forewarned is forearmed.

Kyrie eleison.

# A CHAPTER

No. CCLXIV (264)

*August 4, 2012*

Compared with the Archbishop's Declaration of November, 1974, the final Declaration of the SSPX's July General Chapter is rather weak

As many of you know, a certain bishop was excluded from the General Chapter, or meeting of heads of the Society of St Pius X, held last month in Écône, Switzerland. To confirm the exclusion, use was apparently made of the adaptation by "Eleison Comments" (#257, June 16) of St Paul's seemingly murderous wish that the corruptors of the Catholic Faith be "cut off" (Galatians V, 12). Actually Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine and Chrysostom all think that the wish, in context (Gal.V, 1-12), is aimed at the Judaisers' manhood rather than at their very lives, and Chrysostom thinks it is a jest.

However, when I heard what serious use was being made of the jest at the Chapter, I must admit that I had a naughty vision: I imagined my noble colleagues in SSPX headquarters looking out of the windows at night to see if there might not be a lanky episcopal Englishman, heavily disguised as Jack the Ripper, prowling around in the bushes with a long carving-knife gleaming in the moonlight, seeking someone to carve to pieces. Dear colleagues, sleep easy – I have no murderous ambitions. Honestly!

But the Chapter was serious business. What did it produce? Above all, a Declaration, made public a few days later, and six conditions for any future Rome-SSPX agreement, leaked on the Internet soon after that (given how many souls are presently entrusting their faith and their salvation to the guidance of the SSPX, I find such a leak not unreasonable). Now all honour to the good men at the Chapter who by all accounts did their best to limit the damage, but if the Declaration and conditions give us the present mind of the Society's leaders as a whole, then there has to be cause for concern.

As for the Declaration of 2012, it is enough to compare it for a few moments with Archbishop Lefebvre's Declaration of 1974, to wonder what has happened to his Society. Whereas the Archbishop explicitly and repeatedly denounces the reformation wrought by Vatican II ("born of Liberalism and Modernism, poisoned through and

through, deriving from heresy and ending in heresy”), in words that brought down upon him the wrath of the Conciliar Popes, on the contrary the Declaration of 2012 refers only once to the Council with its “novelties” merely “stained with errors,” in terms that one can easily imagine Benedict XVI underwriting from beginning to end. Does the SSPX now think that the Conciliar Popes represent no serious problem?

As for the six conditions for any future Rome-SSPX agreement, they deserve a detailed examination, but suffice it to say here and now that the demand made by the SSPX’s 2006 General Chapter for a doctrinal agreement prior to any practical agreement seems to have gone completely by the board. Is it now the mind of the SSPX that the doctrine of the Romans to whom they would submit is no longer so important? Or is the SSPX itself succumbing to the charms of Liberalism?

For a contrarian point of view, may I venture to recommend a collection of “Sermons and Doctrinal Conferences” of His Excellency Jack the Ripper from between 1994 and 2009, now available on seven CD’s from <http://truerestorationpress.com/node/52>, with special incentives to purchase expiring at the end of this month? Not every word in these 30 hours of recordings may be golden, some words are no doubt too temperamental, but at least the effort is made to disembowel the enemies and not the friends of our Catholic Faith.

Kyrie eleison.

# FREE-WILL VALUED

No. CCLXV (265)

*August 11, 2012*

God wishes no man's damnation, but men's freely choosing Heaven or Hell is too precious to be overridden by his omnipotence.

Concerning the drama of souls falling into Hell (and many choose to do so – Mt. VII, 13; XXII, 14), a reader raises a classic problem which can be framed briefly as follows. Either God wants souls to be damned, or he doesn't. If he does want it, he is cruel. If he does not want it, yet it still happens, then he is not omnipotent. Then is he cruel, or is he not omnipotent? Which?

Let us establish immediately that God sends no soul to Hell. Every one of the many souls damned sent itself to Hell by the series of choices that it made freely during its time on earth. God gave to it life, time and free-will, and also any number of natural helps and supernatural graces to persuade it to choose to go to Heaven, but if it refused, then God let it have what it wanted, namely an eternity without him. And that loss of God, for a soul made by God only to possess God, is by far its cruellest suffering in Hell. Thus God wished that the soul might choose Heaven ("He will have all men to be saved" – I Tim. II, 4), but he wanted to allow the evil of its choosing Hell in order to bring out of that evil a greater good.

Notice the use made here of the two English words, "wish" and "want." To "want" something is more full-blooded than merely to "wish" it. Thus a family father may well not wish his son to suffer harsh experience in life, but in view of all the circumstances he can want to let him suffer because he knows that that is the only way his son will learn. Similarly in the parable of the Prodigal Son, the father did not wish to let his younger son leave home and squander his heritage, but he wanted to let him do so because that is what the father in fact did, and good did come of it – the return home of the son, now repentant, a sadder but wiser young man.

In the same way God wishes on the one hand all souls to be saved, because that is what he created them for, and that is why he died for all of them on the Cross, where one large part of his suffering lay precisely in his knowing how many souls would not choose to profit by their Redemption to be saved. Such a God can in no way be



considered or called cruel! On the other hand God does not want all souls to be saved unless they also want it, because if he did, they would all be saved, because he is all-powerful, or omnipotent. But, given all the circumstances, that would mean in effect overriding the free choice of those who, left to themselves, would choose not to be saved, and that would mean trampling on their free-will. Now just see how passionately men themselves value their free-will, when you see how they dislike being given orders or like being independent. They know that their free-will is the proof that they are not just animals or robots. So God too prefers his Heaven to be populated with men and not just with animals or robots, and that is why he does not want all men to be saved unless they also want it.

Yet God does not want souls to be damned, because that again would be cruelty on his part. He only wants to allow them to be damned, in view of the circumstances that souls will thus have the eternity of their own choice, and he will have a Heaven of human beings and not just animals or robots.

Thus his wish to save all souls means that he is by no means cruel, while the damnation of many souls proves on his part not a lack of omnipotence, but a choice to value his creatures' free-will, and the infinite delight that he takes in rewarding with Heaven souls that have chosen to love him on earth.

Mother of God, now and in the hour of my death, help me to love your Son and to choose Heaven!

Kyrie eleison.

# DOCTRINE AGAIN

No. CCLXVI (266)

*August 18, 2012*

What drives a man's life is his real doctrine. The Newchurch is driven by a false doctrine of God, man and life.

The scorn of "doctrine" is an immense problem today. The "best" of Catholics in our 21st century pay lip-service to the importance of "doctrine," but in their modern bones they feel instinctively that even Catholic doctrine is some kind of prison for their minds, and minds must not be imprisoned. In Washington, D.C., around the interior dome of the Jefferson Memorial, that quasi-religious temple of the United States' champion of liberty, runs his quasi-religious quotation: I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man. Surely he had Catholic doctrine in mind, amongst others. Modern man's quasi-religion excludes having any fixed doctrine.

However, a sentence from the "Eleison Comments" of two weeks ago (EC 263, July 28) gives a different angle on the nature and importance of "doctrine." It ran: So long as Rome believes in its Conciliar doctrine, it is bound to use any such ("non-doctrinal") agreement to pull the SSPX in the direction of the (Second Vatican) Council. In other words what drives Rome supposedly to discount "doctrine" and at all costs to conciliarize the SSPX is their own belief in their own Conciliar doctrine. As Traditional Catholic doctrine is – one hopes – the driving force of the SSPX, so Conciliar doctrine is the driving force of Rome. The two doctrines clash, but each of them is a driving force.

In other words, "doctrine" is not just a set of ideas in a man's head, or a mental prison. Whatever ideas a man chooses to hold in his head, his real doctrine is that set of ideas that drives his life. Now a man may change that set of ideas, but he cannot not have one. Here is how Aristotle put it: "If you want to philosophize, then you have to philosophize. If you don't want to philosophize, you still have to philosophize. In any case a man has to philosophize." Similarly, liberals may scorn any set of ideas as a tyranny, but to hold any set of ideas to be a tyranny is still a major idea, and it is the one idea that drives the lives of zillions of liberals today, and of all too many Catholics.

These should know better, but all of us moderns have the worship of liberty in our bloodstream.

Thus doctrine in its real sense is not just an imprisoning set of ideas, but that central notion of God, man and life that directs the life of every man alive. Even if a man is committing suicide, he is being driven by the idea that life is too miserable to be worth continuing. A notion of life centred on money may drive a man to become rich; on pleasure to become a rake; on recognition to become famous, and so on. But however a man centrally conceives life, that concept is his real doctrine.

Thus conciliar Romans are driven by Vatican II as being their central notion to undo the SSPX that rejects Vatican II, and until they either succeed or change that central notion, they will continue to be driven to dissolve Archbishop Lefebvre's SSPX. On the contrary the central drive of clergy and laity of the SSPX should be to get to Heaven, the idea being that Heaven and Hell exist, and Jesus Christ and his true Church provide the one and only sure way of getting to Heaven. This driving doctrine they know to be no fanciful invention of their own, and that is why they do not want it to be undermined or subverted or corrupted by the wretched neo-modernists of the Newchurch, driven by their false conciliar notion of God, man and life. The clash is total.

Nor can it be avoided, as liberals dream it can. If falsehoods win, eventually even the stones of the street will cry out (Lk.XIX, 40). If Truth wins, still Satan will go on raising error after error, until the world ends. But "He that perseveres to the end will be saved," says Our Lord (Mt.XXIV, 13).

Kyrie eleison.

## INFECTION? – WHO?

No. CCLXVII (267)

*August 25, 2012*

If the SSPX currently risks compromising with Vatican II, it depends on each of us to put his own house in order.

A favourite proverb of mine comes from China: “The wise man blames himself, the fool blames others.” Not that others are never to blame, obviously, but that I can usually do little or nothing to change their behaviour, whereas I am at least in theory in command of my own. As the *Imitation of Christ* has it, we rarely think with profit on the sins of others, always with profit on our own.

This age-old wisdom is called to mind by the letter of a reader of “Eleison Comments” (# 263) in which she complains of the “Conciliar infection” that she observes in the way in which Society of St Pius X Tridentine Masses in the USA can be celebrated by the priests and attended by the laity. If her dark observations are summarized below, it is not in order to overwhelm priests or laity with the darkness, but to suggest how each of us can examine his own behaviour.

In general she says that the “Conciliar infection” has been creeping into the SSPX chapels for some time. She goes so far as to say that the situation is deteriorating and desperate, and the damage is already done. It is as though Latin has taken pride of place over the Faith, as though anything goes if only it is a Tridentine Mass said in Latin. Not having understood – or retained – what the Mass really is, she says, the laity find it normal merely to attend. Many attend Mass daydreaming, and then they receive Holy Communion in a very disrespectful way, just like in the Newchurch.

She blames the priests for not having sufficiently explained the Faith or the Mass. As for their sermons, she wonders at times whether they understand what they are proclaiming and at times she finds that the personal ideas of the priest and the context of the sermon as a whole come over as Conciliar. Liturgical rules are not respected, rubrics are not consistent, the Canon of the Mass is hurried through. In brief she is not surprised if a number of SSPX priests and layfolk are ready to join the Newchurch, nay, may even already belong to it.

Now nobody in his right mind would claim that her dark description fits all SSPX Masses, but such is the corruption of our age that a deterioration of the kind she observes is all too normal. The corruption presses upon priests and laity alike, and it means that all of us need to observe closely how it may be creeping up on ourselves. As Sister Lucy of Fatima once said in the 1950's, the laity can no longer rely on the clergy to do all the work for them of getting them to Heaven. In fact they never could do so, but a lazy "obedience" is still today a common temptation. If layfolk want good priests to lead them, and if they do not want the SSPX to go Conciliar, then let them observe their own household to put it in order – for instance, how do I myself and my family attend Mass?

As for us priests, let us not forget the dire warning of the prophet Ezechiel (III, 17–21) to pastors: if the pastors tell the people how they are sinning, and the people go on sinning, the Lord God will punish the people but he will not hold the pastors responsible. Contrariwise, if the people sin and the pastors do not tell them how they are sinning, then the Lord God will hold the pastors guilty for the people's sins. "Judgment should begin at the house of God" (I Pet. IV, 17).

Therefore it depends on all of us to do what is in our power to prevent the SSPX from catching the "Conciliar infection." That is today more easily said than done, but as St Paul says (I Cor. IV, 3–5), let each of us look to his own sins. It is God who judges.

Kyrie eleison.

# SIX CONDITIONS

No. CCLXVIII (268)

*September 1, 2012*

The General Chapter's conditions for any future practical agreement with Newrome betray alarming concessions to the religion of man.

In an official letter of July 18 to Superiors of the Society of St Pius X, its General Secretary revealed the six "Conditions" for any future agreement between the SSPX and Rome. These were hammered out by discussion amongst the 39 capitulants of early July. Surely these Conditions demonstrate an alarming weakness on the part of the Society's leaders as a whole.

The first "essential requirement" is freedom for the Society to teach the unchanging truth of Catholic Tradition, and to criticize those responsible for the errors of modernism, liberalism and Vatican II. Well and good. But notice how the Chapter's vision has changed from that of Archbishop Lefebvre. No longer "Rome must convert because Truth is absolute," but now merely "The SSPX demands freedom for itself to tell the Truth." Instead of attacking the Conciliar treachery, the SSPX now wants the traitors to give it permission to tell the Truth? "O, what a fall was there!"

The second condition requires exclusive use of the 1962 liturgy. Again, well and good, insofar as the 1962 liturgy is no such betrayal of the Faith as is the Conciliar liturgy imposed by Rome from 1969 onwards. But do we not right now see Rome preparing to impose on Traditional Congregations that have submitted to its authority a "mutual enrichment" Missal, mixing Tradition and the Novus Ordo? Once the SSPX were to have submitted to Rome, why should it be any more protected?

The third condition requires the guarantee of at least one bishop. The key question here is, who will choose him? Readers, in the text of any future "agreement" with Rome, go straight for the paragraph about the appointment of bishops. In 1988 Rome proposed that the Archbishop present a selection of three candidates for Rome to choose one. Rome then rejected all three. When will people get it? Catholics must fight and fight in this titanic war between the religion of God and the religion of man.

The fourth condition desires that the Society have its own tribunals of the first

instance. But if any higher tribunal is of the official Church and can undo the lower tribunals' decisions, what Catholic decision of any Society tribunal will still have any force at all?

The fifth condition desires exemption of SSPX houses from control by diocesan bishops. Unbelievable! For nigh on 40 years the SSPX has been fighting to save the Faith by protecting its true practice from interference by the local Conciliar bishops, and now comes the General Chapter merely desiring independence from them? The Society is not what it was, dear readers. It is in the hands of people quite different from Archbishop Lefebvre!

The sixth and last condition desires a Commission to be set up in Rome to look after Tradition, with a strong representation from Tradition, but “dependent on the Pope.” Dependent on the Pope? But have the Conciliar Popes not been ringleaders of Conciliarism? Is Conciliarism no longer a problem?

In conclusion, these six conditions are excessively grave. Unless the Society's leadership is shaken out of its dream of peace with Conciliar Rome as revealed by them, then the last worldwide bastion of Catholic Tradition risks being on its way to surrendering to the enemies of the Faith. Maybe bastions are out of date.

Friends, prepare to fight for the Faith from within your homes. Fortify your homes.

Kyrie eleison.

# APRIL AMBIGUITY

No. CCLXIX (269)

*September 8, 2012*

The document submitted by the SSPX to Newrome as a basis for an SSPX-Newrome agreement is fatally ambiguous. Anathema!

In mid-April there was submitted to Rome on behalf of the Society of St Pius X a confidential document, doctrinal in nature, of which it was said that it laid out Catholic principles that all the SSPX authorities could subscribe to. In mid-June Rome rejected the document as basis for a Rome-SSPX agreement. Thank goodness, because it contained a supremely dangerous ambiguity: in brief, does an expression like “The Magisterium of all time” mean up until 1962, or up until 2012? It is all the difference between the religion of God, and the religion of God as changed by modern man, i.e. the religion of man. Here are some of the principles, as summarized for SSPX authorities:—

“1/ . . . Tradition must be the criterion and guide for understanding the teachings of Vatican II. 2/ So the statements of Vatican II and of the post-conciliar papal teaching with regard to ecumenism and interreligious dialogue or religious liberty can only be understood in the light of Tradition complete and uninterrupted, 3/ in a manner that does not clash with the truths previously taught by the Church’s Magisterium, 4/ without accepting any interpretation opposed to, or breaking with, Tradition and that Magisterium . . . .”

The 1962 or 2012 ambiguity lurks here in the words “Tradition” and “Magisterium.” Are these two words being taken to exclude doctrines of the Council (1962–1965) and its aftermath, or are they including them? Any follower of Tradition will read the passage so as to exclude them, because he knows that there is a huge difference between the Church and the Newchurch. But any believer in Vatican II can so read the passage as to be able to pretend that there is a seamless continuity between the Church before and after the Council. Let us take a closer look at how the Traditionalist and the Conciliarist can each read the passage in his own way.

Firstly, the Traditional reading:— “1/ Pre-conciliar Tradition has got to be the measure and judge of Council teachings (and not the other way round). 2/ So



Conciliar and post-conciliar teaching must all be sifted according to the whole of Traditional teaching prior to the Council, 3/ so as not to clash with anything that the Magisterium taught prior to the Council, 4/ accepting no interpretation or text that breaks with the pre-conciliar Tradition or Magisterium.”

Secondly, the Conciliar reading (certainly that of the Romans in charge of today’s Church):— “1/ Tradition from before and after the Council (because there is no difference) must be judge of the Council. 2/ So Conciliar teaching on controversial subjects must be sifted according to the Church’s one complete pre- and post-conciliar Tradition (because that alone is the “completeness” of Tradition), 3/ so as not to clash with the Church’s pre- or post-conciliar Magisterium (because they teach the same), 4/ accepting no interpretation that breaks with pre- or post-conciliar Tradition or Magisterium (because there is no break between all four of them).”

This Conciliar reading means that the Council will be judged by the Council, which means of course that it will be acquitted. On the contrary by the Traditional reading the Council is utterly condemned. Ambiguity is deadly for the Faith. Somebody here is meaning to play games with our Catholic minds. Let whoever it is be anathema!

Kyrie eleison.

## “REBELLIOUS, DIVISIVE”

No. CCLXX (270)

*September 15, 2012*

Those who seem divisive rebels are not always the real rebels. John VII shows the crowd being divided by Our Lord’s teaching.

The seventh chapter of the Gospel of St John has a special lesson for today: who are the real rebels against authority, and who are the merely apparent rebels? Who appears to be dividing the people of God, and who is really dividing them? Things are not always what they appear. It is necessary always to “Judge not according to the appearances, but judge just judgment” (Jn. VII, 24).

John VII is close to the end of Our Lord’s life on earth. The Jews are seeking to kill Jesus (verse 1), but Our Lord nevertheless goes up to Jerusalem and teaches in the Temple (14). The crowd is already divided (12), and so the effect of his teaching is that some people (40) recognize in him the prophet (cf. Deut.XVIII, 15–19), while others (41, 42) refuse him that recognition because he is from Galilee. So there is division and dissension. Now division as such is blameworthy, so who is to blame? Certainly not Our Lord, who is merely preaching the doctrine of his Father in Heaven (16–17). Nor can that part of the crowd be blamed which accepted the divine teaching. Clearly the blame for the dissension lies with the Temple authorities and that part of the crowd that was refusing the Truth.

Similarly in the 1970’s and 1980’s Archbishop Lefebvre divided Catholics by teaching and practising the truth of Catholic Tradition, but what Catholic that now boasts of being Traditional blames him for that division? Clearly the blame for the division of the Church lay neither with the Archbishop nor with those who followed him, but mainly with those Church authorities who were twisting the true religion, like the Temple authorities in Our Lord’s own day. Again and again the Archbishop pleaded with them to “judge just judgment” by confronting the central problem created by their Conciliar adultery with the modern world. To this day they refuse that confrontation. Again and again their only answer has been, “Obedience!,” “Unity!.” Does not their lack of arguments as to the basic questions of truth suggest it is they who are the true rebels and dividers of the Church?

Yet dissension as such is not a good thing, and both Our Lord and Archbishop Lefebvre knew ahead that dissension would follow on their teaching. Why then did they still go ahead? Because souls can be saved with dissension (cf. Lk.XII, 51–53), but they cannot be saved without Truth. If the religious authorities are misleading the people – and the Devil works especially hard on them because of their power to lead many other souls astray – then the Truth must be told to bring people back on the path to Heaven, even if dissension will be the result. In this respect Truth is above authority or unity.

And where is that truth in 2012? Vatican II was a disaster for the Church – true or false? The Church authorities who brought about Assisi III and John-Paul II’s “beatification” are clinging to Vatican II – true or false? And so if the Society of Pius X puts itself under those same authorities, they will use all their prestige, and the power over the SSPX that it will have given them, to dissolve its resistance to Vatican II – true or false? So the SSPX runs a grave risk of losing steadily whatever will it still has to resist that prestige and power – true or false? As Romans say, “Rome can wait”!

Then in the SSPX today, if one “judges not according to the appearance but just judgment,” who is it that is being truly “divisive”? Who are the real “rebels against authority”? Those who criticize such a risk of blending Catholic Truth with Conciliar error, or those who are promoting it?

Kyrie eleison.

# REVERSIBLE DECLARATION

No. CCLXXI (271)

*September 22, 2012*

The General Chapter's concluding Declaration is strong on piety but weak on doctrine, with a fatal ambiguity in its doctrinal sections.

Not everything about the General Chapter of the Society of St Pius X held in Switzerland in July may have been disastrous, but of its two official fruits, the "Six Conditions" were "alarmingly weak" (cf. EC 268, Sept. 1), and its final "Declaration" leaves much to be desired. Here is the briefest of summaries of its ten paragraphs:—

1 We thank God for 42 years of our Society's existence. 2 We have rediscovered our unity after the recent crisis(really?), 3 in order to profess our faith 4 in the Church, in the Pope, in Christ the King. 5 We hold to the Church's constant Magisterium, 6 as also to its constant Tradition. 7 We join with all Catholics now being persecuted. 8 We pray for help to the Blessed Virgin Mary, 9 to St. Michael 10 and to St Pius X. This is a Declaration not lacking in piety, which St Paul says is useful for all purposes (I Tim. IV, 8). However, to his two disciples, Timothy and Titus, he is constantly emphasizing the need for doctrine, which is the foundation of true piety. Alas, the Declaration is rather less strong in doctrine. Instead of blasting the Council's doctrinal errors which have been devastating the Church for the last 50 years, it has in its most doctrinal paragraphs, 5 and 6, only a timid condemnation of those errors, together with a tribute to the unchanging Magisterium (5) and Tradition (6) of the Church, accurate but constituting an argument all too easily reversible by a Conciliarist. See how:—

Paragraph 5 mentions Vatican II novelties being "stained with errors," whereas the Church's constant Magisterium is uninterrupted: "By its act of teaching it transmits the revealed deposit in perfect harmony with everything the universal Church has taught in all times and places." Which of course implies that Rome should take Vatican II to the cleaners to take out the stains. But see how a Roman can reply: "The Chapter's expression of the continuity of the Magisterium is wholly admirable! But we Romans are that Magisterium, and we say that Vatican II is not stained!"

Similarly with paragraph 6. The Declaration states, "The constant Tradition of the

Church transmits and will transmit to the end of time the collection of teachings necessary to keep the Faith and save one's soul." So the Church authorities need to return to Tradition. Roman reply: "The Chapter's description of how Tradition hands down the Faith is wholly admirable! But we Romans are the guardians of that Tradition, and we say, by the hermeneutic of continuity, that Vatican II does not interrupt it but continues it. So the Chapter is entirely wrong to suggest that we need to return to it."

Contrast the force of Archbishop Lefebvre's irreversible attack on the errors of Vatican II in his famous Declaration of November, 1974. He declares that Conciliar Rome is not Catholic Rome because the Conciliar reform is "naturalist, Teilhardian, liberal and Protestant . . . poisoned through and through . . . coming from heresy and leading to heresy," etc, etc. His conclusion is a categorical refusal to have anything to do with the Newrome because it is absolutely not the true Rome.

Pull up on the Internet both Declarations, and see which is an unmistakeable trumpet-call for the necessary battle (I Cor.XIV, 8)! One has to wonder how many of the 2012 capitulants have ever studied what the Archbishop said, and why.

Kyrie eleison.

## SARTO, SIRI?

No. CCLXXII (272)

*September 29, 2012*

Cardinal Siri was a fine churchman, but by his lack of reaction to the disaster of Vatican II, arguably not fine enough.

In a sermon for the Feast of St Pius X I found myself uttering « almost a heresy »: I wondered aloud whether Giuseppe Sarto would have disobeyed Paul VI's destruction of the Church, if, instead of dying as Pope Pius X in 1914, he had died as a Cardinal in, say, 1974. Within the Society of St Pius X that must sound like a heresy because how can the wisdom of the heavenly patron of the SSPX be in any way flawed? Yet the question is not idle.

In the 1970's Archbishop Lefebvre made personal visits to a number of the Church's best cardinals and bishops in the hope of persuading a mere handful of them to offer public resistance to the Vatican II revolution. He used to say that just half a dozen bishops resisting together could have seriously obstructed the Conciliar devastation of the Church. Alas, not even Pius XII's choice of successor, Cardinal Siri of Genoa, would make a public move against the Church Establishment. Finally Bishop de Castro Mayer stepped forward, but only in the 1980's, by when the Conciliar Revolution was well ensconced at the top of the Church.

So how could the best of well-trained minds have been so darkened? How could so few of the best churchmen at that time not have seen what the Archbishop was seeing, for instance that the "law" establishing the Novus Ordo Mass was no law at all, because it belongs to the very nature of law to be an ordinance of reason for the common good? How could he have been so relatively alone in not letting such a basic principle of common sense be smothered by respect for authority, when the Church's very survival was being placed in peril by Vatican II and the New Mass? How can authority have so gained the upper hand on reality and truth?

My own answer is that for seven centuries Christendom has been sliding into apostasy. For 700 years, with noble interruptions like the Counter-Reformation, the reality of Catholicism has been slowly eaten away by the cancerous fantasy of liberalism, which is the freeing of man from God by the freeing of nature from grace,

of mind from objective truth and of will from objective right and wrong. For the longest time, 650 years, the Catholic churchmen clung to and defended reality, but finally enough of the engrossing fantasy of glamorous modernity worked its way into their bones for reality to lose its grip on their minds and wills. Lacking grace, as St Thomas More said of the English bishops in his time betraying the Catholic Church, the Conciliar bishops let men's fantasy take over from God's reality, and authority take over from truth. There are practical lessons for clergy and laity alike.

Colleagues inside and outside the SSPX, to serve God, let us beware of reacting like Giuseppe Siri when we need to be reacting like Giuseppe Sarto, with his magnificent denunciations of the modern errors in Pascendi, Lamentabili and the Letter on the Sillon. And to obtain the grace we need in this most tremendous crisis of all Church history, we need tremendously to pray.

Layfolk, if horrors of modern life make you "hunger and thirst after justice," rejoice if you can that the horrors are keeping you real, and do not doubt that if you persevere in your hunger, you will "have your fill" (Mt.V, 6). Blessed are the poor in spirit, the meek, and they that mourn, says Our Lord, in the same place. As for the surest protection against your minds and hearts being taken over by the fantasy, pray five, better fifteen, Mysteries a day of Our Lady's Holy Rosary.

Kyrie eleison.

# MORE AMMUNITION

No. CCLXXIII (273)

October 6, 2012

The author of “Eleison Comments” offers for readers’ delight a little collection of counter-comments, many going back to Sweden.

Enjoying the privilege of having a variety of friends shooting at me from all directions, I cannot bear the thought of them running out of ammunition, so here is a collection of bullets and shells gathered from the battlefield. The comments came from priests, layfolk and Sisters, mainly upset by a certain episode in modern history being denied on Swedish TV in November of 2008. (And yet . . . and yet . . .) As Americans say, “Enjoy!”

“That bishop has a strong temperament with much prestige and authority, so he could not bear not being Number One in the Society of St Pius X. Wishing then to make himself a name in the history books, but realizing that at 68 years of age he would have no more chance of being elected Superior General, he detonated on Swedish TV the “Revisionist Bomb” in order to get attention and come out top dog. To gain influence he was willing to risk splitting the SSPX.”

“He decided on all-out provocation by the broadcast in order to throw a monkey-wrench into the Rome-SSPX talks which he disapproved of. But being in a subordinate position, only by such a scandal could he stop the dialogue and the agreement that might have come of it.”

“He loves provoking because he is an infiltrator, a former Anglican who is still basically hostile to the Catholic Church. Any Rome-SSPX agreement he wanted to block, because it would be too favourable to the SSPX, i.e. to the Catholic Church.”

“He is an illuminated supernaturalist, a conspiracy nut, obsessed with the Jewish peril. He sees the Apocalypse coming tomorrow. Neither he nor Revisionism are serious.”

“He has natural qualities that make him worldly and ambitious. He is used to everybody paying him homage. He used to have influence over many people, and he was treated like a little god when he was still travelling. However, because of his personal qualities he is proud and jealous of Bishop Fellay, so out of envy and



resentment he let loose on Swedish TV.”

“Actually, long before the Swedish affair he was too political and too independent of the rest of the SSPX, whose spirit he did not entirely share. In 2004 he publicly attacked the leadership of the SSPX for its jansenizing spirit and its supernaturalism. In reality he was merely settling personal accounts, as churchmen are liable to do.”

“His originality goes with a complete lack of sense of responsibility, which is why he rode that anti-semitic hobby-horse of his in public without a thought for the harm he might do to Tradition. In fact he was manipulated by Fascists and Neo-pagans, or at least he was exploited by them. He was not out for personal power on that occasion, but he is unpredictable, and he is not to be trusted.” And all these things are being said about me! I just love the attention!

Kyrie eleison.

# ELMER GANTRY

No. CCLXXIV (274)

*October 13, 2012*

Two quotes from a Hollywood film endure down the years: man's need for the true religion, or, for dictatorial lies.

On the in-seat entertainment system of a long-distance flight I recently found, listed as a "classic," a film I could remember from having watched it some 50 years ago – the film version made in 1960 of Sinclair Lewis' novel, *Elmer Gantry*. I remembered the film because two remarks from the dialogue have stayed with me ever since. One is of an old man comparing religious conversion to getting drunk. The other is of a young woman begging to be lied to. I watched the film again . . .

*Elmer Gantry* is an American con-man of the 1920's who falls for a revivalist woman preacher, Sister Falconer, while she is conducting a cross-country crusade for conversions in a big travelling tent. Lacking any real religion, the film is somewhat confused, but it does portray both the genuine need that souls have of some religion, and the falsehood of the fundamentalist Protestant "religion." The true need and the false satisfaction are highlighted together when Elmer puts questions to an old man cleaning up in the tent: "Mister," he replies, leaning on his broom, "I've been converted five times. Billy Sunday, Reverend Biederwolf, Gypsy Smith and twice by Sister Falconer. I get terrible drunk, and then I get good and saved. Both of them done me a powerful lot of good – gettin' drunk and gettin' saved."

Of course the remark has its comic side, but it is tragic when one thinks of all the souls for whom it has become a kind of common sense to put religious conversion on a level with drink. That is survivalism replacing revivalism, well on the way to religion being ridiculed altogether. How many souls there must be for whom the Holy Name of "Jesus" has been virtually burnt out by its association with the emotionalism of fundamentalist preachers! Read "Wise Blood" and other stories by Flannery O'Connor (1925–1964), a Catholic writer who shocks but is not confused, and who portrays just how far man's religious instinct can be bent out of shape by the Protestantism of America's Deep South. God can make roses grow out of a sewer, but heresy does terrible damage!

The second remark that I remembered from the film arises in a private context, but its potential application is far wider. While pursuing Sister Falconer, Elmer runs by chance into a woman that he mistreated and abandoned years earlier. When this woman learns of his affair with Sister, she wants her revenge, but even whilst laying a honey-trap for Elmer to discredit him utterly in the media, she cannot help herself wanting him to tell her that he loves her. She says: "Tell me a good, strong lie I can believe, but hold me tight." Loving him still as she does, all she wants is to be deceived.

Such is the world around us. All it asks is to be deceived. That is why we are living in a world of Satan's lies. We do not want God. Now, life without him cannot work – see Ps. 126, v.1, and just look around you – but we desperately want to believe that life works best of all without him. In effect we say to our leaders, "We elected you to tell us good, strong lies, and to hold us tight in our godlessness. Please do a 9/11, a 7/7 (U.K.'s 9/11), or anything you like, just so long as we can go on believing in you as a substitute for God to look after us. The bigger the lie, the more we will believe it, but you must hold us tight. Tighten up our police states as much as you like, but you must keep out God."

Is it any wonder we have the satanic world we have?

Kyrie eleison.

# HOME READING

No. CCLXXV (275)

October 20, 2012

Maria Valtorta's controversial Poem of the man-God is defended against attack, and recommended for family reading in the home.

When a while back these "Comments" advised readers to fortify their homes in case public bastions of the Faith might, due to the wickedness of the times, prove to be a thing of the past, a few readers wrote in to ask just how homes might be fortified. In fact various spiritual and material means of defending home and family have been suggested in previous numbers of the "Comments," notably of course the Holy Rosary, but one fortification has gone unmentioned which I think I would try in place of television if I had a family to defend: reading aloud each night to the children selected chapters from Maria Valtorta's Poem of the Man-God. And when we had reached the end of the five volumes in English, I imagine us starting again from the beginning, and so on, until all the children had left home!

Yet the Poem has many and eloquent enemies. It consists of episodes from the lives of Our Lord and Our Lady, from her immaculate conception through to her assumption into Heaven, as seen in visions received, believably from Heaven, during the Second World War in northern Italy by Maria Valtorta, an unmarried woman of mature age lying in a sick-bed, permanently crippled from an injury to her back inflicted several years earlier. Notes included in the Italian edition (running to over four thousand pages in ten volumes) show how afraid she was of being deceived by the Devil, and many people are not in fact convinced that the Poem truly came from God. Let us look at three main objections.

Firstly, the Poem was put on the Church's Index of forbidden books in the 1950's, which was before Rome went neo-modernist in the 1960's. The reason given for the condemnation was the romanticizing and sentimentalizing of the Gospel events. Secondly the Poem is accused of countless doctrinal errors. Thirdly Archbishop Lefebvre objected to the Poem that its giving so many physical details of Our Lord's daily life makes him too material, and brings us too far down from the spiritual level of the four Gospels.

But firstly, how could the modernists have taken over Rome in the 1960's, as they did, had they not already been well established within Rome in the 1950's? The Poem, like the Gospels (e.g. Jn.XI, 35, etc.), is full of sentiment but always proportional to its object. The Poem is for any sane judge, in my opinion, neither sentimental nor romanticized. Secondly, the seeming doctrinal errors are not difficult to explain, one by one, as is done by a competent theologian in the notes to be found in the Italian edition of the Poem. And thirdly, with all due respect to Archbishop Lefebvre, I would argue that modern man needs the material detail for him to believe again in the reality of the Gospels. Has not too much "spirituality" kicked Our Lord upstairs, so to speak, while cinema and television have taken over modern man's sense of reality on the ground floor? As Our Lord was true man and true God, so the Poem is at every moment both fully spiritual and fully material.

From non-electronic reading of the Poem in the home, I can imagine many benefits, besides the real live contact between parents reading and children listening. Children soak in from their surroundings like sponges soak in water. From the reading of chapters of the Poem selected according to the children's age, I can imagine almost no end to how much they could learn about Our Lord and Our Lady. And the questions they would ask! And the answers that the parents would have to come up with! I do believe the Poem could greatly fortify a home.

Kyrie eleison.

# MOMENTOUS DECISION

No. CCLXXVI (276)

*October 27, 2012*

The author of “Eleison Comments” has been excluded from the Newsociety of Bishop Fellay, not a good sign for the old SSPX.

So the exclusion from the Society of St Pius X of one of the four bishops consecrated for its service by Archbishop Lefebvre in 1988 is now official. It is a momentous decision on the part of the SSPX leaders, not for any personal reasons, but because of the removal of what many people took to be the single biggest obstacle within the SSPX to any false reconciliation between Catholic Tradition and Conciliar Rome. Now that he is gone, the SSPX may the more easily continue its slide into comfortable liberalism.

If the problem was merely his person, there might be no serious consequences. He is 72 years old (and “more or less gaga”) with not too many active years left ahead of him. He could be safely ignored, or further discredited if need be, and left to rant and rave in his isolated retirement. But if indeed his exclusion does mean the repudiation of that opposition to Rome which he represented, then the SSPX is in trouble, and far from resolving its interior tensions by having made an example of him, it is liable now to be racked with silent dissension or open contradiction.

This is because Archbishop Lefebvre founded the SSPX to resist the Council’s destruction of the Catholic Faith by its 16 documents, and of the practice of that Faith by the New Mass above all. Resisting the Council was built into the very nature of the Society. Now to undo a thing’s nature is to undo the thing. It would follow that with this exclusion the SSPX of Archbishop Lefebvre is well on its way to being undone, and it will be replaced by something quite different. Actually that transformation has been observable for many years. The exclusion is merely one final blow.

Not that the Archbishop was primarily, or only, against the Council. Primarily he was Catholic, a Catholic bishop, a true pastor of souls, as is clear from his writings prior to the Council. But once that unspeakable disaster for the Church had taken place, he soon saw that the most urgent task in defence of the Faith was to resist the Vatican II

Revolution which was taking over millions and millions of Catholic hearts and minds. Hence his founding in 1970 of the SSPX which would use exclusively the Tridentine rite of Mass. Hence his famous Declaration of November, 1974, which was like a charter of the Catholic principles inspiring the SSPX's resistance. Only the conversion and reversion of the Church authorities to the true Faith can justify the abandoning of those principles. And has such a conversion or reversion taken place? By no means. On the contrary.

And the future? To fill the vacuum left by abandoning the purposes of the Archbishop, probably the mainstream SSPX now hastens into the arms of Rome, especially if Benedict XVI's conscience is driving him to end the "schism" before he dies. The bishop's exclusion may or may not have been a pre-condition set by Rome for a Rome-SSPX agreement, but in any case it certainly favours one. SSPX priests who see clear might lie low for the moment and wait for a flock of chickens to begin to come home to roost. SSPX laity might attend SSPX Masses for the time being, but they should watch out for the moment when the transformation mentioned above begins to threaten their faith. As for the excluded bishop, any donations to him or his cause will have to wait a little until the necessary arrangements can be set up. But be sure of one thing: he is not thinking of retiring.

Hang tight, everybody. We are in for one "helluva" ride. Let's just make that a ride to Heaven!

Kyrie eleison.

## AND NOW?

No. CCLXXVII (277)

*November 3, 2012*

Archbishop Lefebvre said that we must follow Providence. We must not be in a hurry. We should not seek publicity. Patience.

Last week's news of the expulsion of one of the four bishops of the Society of St Pius X brought in a large number of e-mails of support and encouragement. To every one of you, many thanks. Such a serious division amongst the Society's bishops is a great shame, but God has his reasons for allowing it to happen, and it is obvious that a number of you understand that the Faith comes before unity. Not division, but loss of Faith is the ultimate evil (I Cor.XI, 19; I Jn.II, 19). As to how the titanic war between the friends and enemies of that Faith will develop, I myself can see at this moment only the broad lines. Let me resort to three favourite quotations of Archbishop Lefebvre, which I think still apply today.

Firstly, "We must follow Providence, and not try to lead it." If it is true that "Charity hopes all things" (I Cor. XIII, 7), then the Society may be given a little time yet to right itself before it is written off as one more Traditional group gone over to the enemy. That is why I said last week that SSPX priests might lie low for the moment to watch how things develop, while the laity might continue to attend Society Masses, but both must watch out (Mt. XXVI, 41) for contradictions in doctrine, for slackening in morals. The temptation will be to prefer comfort and routine over hardship and upheaval, as did thousands of priests and millions of layfolk after Vatican II, so that they ended up by losing the Faith. We are entitled to wait for Providence to show us which way is the way forward. We are not entitled to lose the Faith.

Secondly, "Time respects nothing done without it." In other words, it takes time to build something solid. We may be in a hurry. God is not. The Archbishop took his time to build the Society. Vatican II concluded its devilry in 1965. Only 11 years later did the first large batch of priests come out of the Archbishop's first seminary. Patience. He had not rushed.

Thirdly, "Good is not noisy and noise is not good." The public domain today is thoroughly poisoned. To try to reach a large audience of modern men is to lay oneself



wide open to the risk of the tail wagging the dog, of the audience bending the message, and the messenger, to suit its own corruption. The archbishop rarely went after the media, but they were always after him, because his message was unbending, and that was proof that “Our faith is our victory over the world” (I Jn.V, 4), and not our making noise on the public scene.

In brief, I think that the situation of today’s Catholic Resistance calls for no hurried action, but for a thoughtful measuring of men and events until the will of God becomes more clear. I think – I may be wrong – that he wants a loose network of independent pockets of Resistance, gathered around the Mass, freely contacting one another, but with no structure of false obedience such as served to sink the mainstream Church in the 1960’s, and is now sinking the Society of St Pius X. If you agree, by all means make contributions to the St Marcel Initiative because they will certainly come in useful, maybe sooner than I think. For myself, as soon as my situation stabilizes in England, I am ready to put my bishop’s powers at the disposal of whoever can make wise use of them.

In the USA paper checks can be made out to St Marcel Initiative and mailed to St Marcel Initiative, P.O.Box 764, Carrollton, VA 23314, USA. Contributions by credit card or debit card or direct debit / bank wire may be made at [www.stmarcelinitiative.com](http://www.stmarcelinitiative.com). For paper check contributions from the U.K. and the Eurozone, details as to where they may be sent will be provided as soon as possible.

Kyrie eleison.

## “MARCELLUS INITIATIVE”

No. CCLXXVIII (278)

*November 10, 2012*

It is not clear that the present need is to rebuild a classic Congregation or Seminary. Both may be somehow out-dated.

After last week's presentation of details of the “Marcellus Initiative” set up to facilitate donations to the cause of an « expelled » bishop, a few readers reasonably asked what the “Initiative” would be for. To begin with, it will cover his personal expenses of moving out of Wimbledon, maybe out of London, and then living elsewhere. Over and above those expenses, the word “Initiative” was chosen deliberately to leave options open. However, it is important that nobody should think that their donations will any time soon go to the setting up of a replacement for the Society of St Pius X or a substitute seminary. There are good reasons for not hurrying to do either.

As for an alternative to the SSPX, we must learn the lessons to be drawn from its present severe crisis. The Catholic Church runs on authority, from the Pope downwards, but our Revolutionary world has today so broken down men's natural sense of authority that few know how to command, and most men obey either too little or too much. We have, so to speak, run out of that peasant common sense that enabled Catholic authority to function. Thus as God alone could establish Moses' authority by a sensational chastisement of rebels (cf. Numbers XVI), so in our day surely God alone will be able to restore the Pope's authority. Will it be by “a rain of fire,” such as Our Lady of Akita forewarned in Japan in 1973? Be that as it may, oases of the Faith remain an immediate and practical possibility, and I will do my best to serve them.

Similar arguments apply to the re-starting of a classical Catholic seminary. One cannot make bricks without straw, says the old proverb. It is more and more difficult to make Catholic priests out of modern young men, say I. Supernatural qualities of faith, good will and piety go a long way, but grace builds on nature, and the natural foundations, such as a solid home and a truly human education, are more and more lacking. Of course there are still good families where the parents have understood what their religion requires of them to put their children on the path to Heaven, and

where they are doing their heroic best. But our wicked world is set upon destroying all common sense and natural decency, of gender, family and country. With the best of good will, the children of today's social environment remain in general more or less severely handicapped when it comes to perceiving or following a call of God.

Does that mean that God has given up on his Church, or that he means to leave us without priests for tomorrow? Of course not. But it does mean that no Catholic organisation set up tomorrow to save souls can be allowed to lose its vision of the soul-destroying nature of the Conciliar Church and the modern world. It does mean that priests can no longer be formed tomorrow to have a perfect knowledge of St Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* while having little to no idea of how it applies in real life today.

By hook or by crook, tomorrow's Congregations and seminaries must keep their grip on reality, and not get lost in dreams of how "normal" they are, or need to be. Can it be done? With God's help, yes. But God is God, and for the salvation of souls tomorrow it may be that he will no longer resort to the classical Congregation or seminary of yesterday. For myself, I shall attempt to follow his Providence in the ordaining of priests – or in the consecrating of bishops. God's will be done.

Kyrie eleison.

# DEEP PROBLEM

No. CCLXXIX (279)

*November 17, 2012*

The problems of the Newchurch go back to the late Middle Ages. Vatican II was merely the end of a long process.

Many Catholics do not conceive of the full depth of the problem posed by the Conciliar Revolution of Vatican II (1962–1965) in the Catholic Church. If they knew more Church history, they might be less tempted either by liberalism to think that the Council was not all that bad, or by “sedevacantism” to think that the Church authorities are no longer its authorities. Did Our Lord question the religious authority of Caiphas or the civil authority of Pontius Pilate?

The problem is deep because it is buried beneath centuries and centuries of Church history. When in the early 1400’s St Vincent Ferrer (1357–1419) preached all over Europe that the end of the world was at hand, we today know that he was out by over 600 years. Yet God confirmed his preaching by granting him to work thousands of miracles and thousands upon thousands of conversions. Was God confirming untruth? Perish the thought! The truth is that the Saint was correctly discerning, implicit in the decadence of the end of the Middle Ages, the explicit and near total corruption of our own times, dress rehearsal for the total corruption of the end of the world.

It has merely taken time, God’s own time, several centuries, for that implicit corruption to become explicit, because God has chosen at regular intervals to raise Saints to hold up the downward slide, notably the crop of famous Saints that led the Counter-Reformation in the 16th century. However, he would not take away men’s free-will, so that if they chose not to stay on the heights of the Middle Ages, he would not force them to do so. Instead he would allow his Church, at least to some extent, to adapt to the times, because it exists to save present souls and not past glories.

Two examples might be Molinist theology, made virtually necessary by Luther and Calvin to guarantee the protection of free-will, and the Concordat of 1801, made necessary by the Revolutionary State to enable the Church in France to function at all in public. Now both Molinism and the Concordat were compromises with the world of their time, but both enabled many souls to be saved, while the Church allowed

neither to undermine the principles which remained sacred, of God as Pure Act and of Christ as the King of Society respectively. However both compromises allowed for a certain humanising of the divine Church, and both contributed to a gradual secularising of Christendom. Compromises do have consequences.

Thus if a slow process of humanizing and secularizing were to go too far in that world from which alone men and women are called by God to serve in his Church, they could hardly enter his service without a strong dose of radio-active liberalism in their bones, calling for a vigorous antidote in their religious formation. Naturally they would share the instinctive conviction of almost all their contemporaries that the revolutionary principles and ideals of the world from which they came were normal, while their religious formation opposed to that world might seem pious but fundamentally abnormal. Such churchmen and churchwomen could be a disaster waiting to happen. That disaster struck in mid-20th century. A large proportion of the world's 2000 Catholic bishops rejoiced instead of revolting when John XXIII made clear that he was abandoning the anti-modern Church.

So nobody who wants to save his soul should follow them or their successors, but on the other hand the latter are so convinced that they are normal in relation to modern times that they are not as guilty as they would have been in previous times for destroying Christ's Church. Blessed are the Catholic souls that can abhor their errors, but still honour their office.

Kyrie eleison.

# Dictatorship Imminent

No. CCLXXX (280)

November 24, 2012

A tragi-comic scene in New Jersey exemplifies the mass control of modern citizens by unscrupulous manipulators. It is our own fault.

A remarkable portrait of our contemporary world appeared two months ago on the Internet website, 321gold. The title is daunting: “Decline, Decay, Denial, Delusion and Despair,” but the content is surely true to life. Starting from a street scene to be found no doubt all over the eastern United States, the author concludes that within 15 years an Orwellian dictatorship will descend upon his country as the unwanted effect of wanted causes. But the USA is not typical of the whole world? The whole world is buying into the American way of life. “Let the buyer beware”!

This autumn in the streets of Wildwood, New Jersey, the author observed pavements encumbered with a host of heavily overweight men and women under 50 years of age rolling around town on government-subsidized mobility scooters to visit one fast-food joint after another in order to gorge on sugar-laden goodies which would give their latest model scooters more work than ever. His amusing name for them? – “The weight-challenged disabled on their powered mobility enhancement vehicles.” Such is the flight from reality of “political correctness” and its language.

The author seeks causes for this tragic-comic effect: how can the American people that once saved 12% of their income have been persuaded to frighten the obesity statistics off the end of the charts with a debt-laden, sugar-sodden way of life, with no more savings for themselves and with an unbearable burden of debt being bequeathed to their children and grand-children? Of course there is a lack of self-control on their part, he says, but there must be something more sinister, some mind behind such a mindless scene. He says the mass of citizens are being manipulated by an invisible government that has mastered the modern techniques of mass manipulation.

He quotes a pioneer of these masters from the 1920’s, Edward Bernays: “The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the masses is an important element in democratic society . . . Vast numbers of human beings must cooperate in this manner if they are to live together as a smoothly functioning society . . . Whether in politics,

business, social conduct or ethical thinking, we are dominated by the relatively small number of persons . . . who understand the mental processes and social patterns of the masses.” They are “the true ruling power of the country,” and they “pull the wires which control the public mind.” For what purpose? For their own wealth and power.

It is they who have organized today’s financial and economic crisis for their own benefit. They have “wrecked the world economy . . . shifted their worthless debt onto the backs of taxpayers and unborn generations, thrown senior citizens and savers under the bus by stealing 400 billion per year of interest from them, and enriched themselves with bubble-level profits and bonus payments.” And when the plug has to be pulled on this unsustainable way of life, then our invisible masters have prepared for us a 1984 “dictatorship of tears” with militarized police with millions of bullets, surveillance cameras and drones everywhere, imprisonment without charges and so on and so on. Yet, says the author, it is the citizens’ own fault who have preferred ignorance to truth, sickness to health, media lies to critical thinking, security to liberty.

There is only one thing lacking to this admirable analysis: could our governing elite have run so wild, or our masses have turned so dumb, if either had retained the least sense of a God who judges us all at death, according to Ten Commandments? Of course not. Catholics, wake up!

Kyrie eleison.

# VARIOUS “CHURCHES”

No. CCLXXXI (281)

*December 1, 2012*

An attempt is made to sort out the various names for the Church. The true Church is recognized by its four marks.

Much confusion reigns today over the identity of Our Lord’s true Church here on earth, and the variety of names by which it can be called. Easily most of the present confusion comes from the Church’s biggest problem of today, which is the diabolical Second Vatican Council (1962–1965). Let us attempt to disentangle some of the confusion.

“Church” derives from the Old English “cirice,” deriving in turn from the Greek word “kuriakon,” meaning “of the Lord.” Thus “Doma kuriakon” meant “house of the Lord,” and from naming the building, “church” came to mean also the people that were regularly to be found in the building.

“Catholic” Church names many a building, but principally the worldwide group of people (“katholos” in Greek means “universal”) who share one Faith, one set of Sacraments and one Hierarchy, all three having been established by the Incarnate God, Our Lord Jesus Christ, in his life on earth two thousand years ago. But from this original group of believers as instituted by Our Lord, other groups have regularly broken away, while still claiming to be Christ’s true Church. How then am I to know which is his true Church?

“Christ’s Church” has four Marks, as they are called. 1 One – above all by oneness of Faith Our Lord meant to unite his Church and not to found many churches (cf. Jn. XVII, 21–23: “That they may be one”). 2 Holy – Our Lord founded his Church to bring men to the All-Holy God and his holy Heaven (cf. Mt. V, 48: “Be you perfect”). 3 Catholic – Our Lord founded his Church for all men of all lands and all ages (cf. Mt. XXVIII, 19: “Going, teach ye all nations”). 4 Apostolic – Our Lord founded his Church as a monarchy, to be ruled by the Apostle Peter and his successors (cf. Mt. XVI, 18: “Thou art Peter and upon this rock (in Greek “petran”) I will found my Church”). Wherever these four Marks are, there is Christ’s true Church. Where they are lacking, there is not Christ’s Church.



“Conciliar Church” means the God-centred Catholic Church as fallen and still falling under the sway of the man-centred Second Vatican Council. Conciliarism (the distilled error of Vatican II) bears the same relation to the true Church of Christ as the rot of a rotten apple bears to the apple which it is rotting. Just as rot occupies the apple, depends on the apple, cannot exist without the apple, yet is quite different from the apple (as uneatable is different from eatable), so man-centred Conciliarism so occupies Christ’s Church that little of the Church is not more or less rotten, yet Conciliarism is so different from Catholicism that one can truly say that the Conciliar Church is not the Catholic Church. But the Catholic Church is visible. Isn’t the Conciliar Church also visible?

“Visible Church” means all the buildings, officials and people of the Church that we can see with our eyes. But to say that the Catholic Church is visible, therefore the visible Church is the Catholic Church, is as foolish as to say that all lions are animals so all animals are lions. That part alone of the visible Church is Catholic which is one, holy, universal and apostolic. The rest is various sorts of rot.

“Official Church” means the Church as led by, and following, its visible officials. Since these today are largely Conciliar, so the “official Church” is largely Conciliar and not Catholic, according to the four Marks. Similarly “Mainstream Church” means today’s official Church as opposed to the “Traditionalist” remnant. However, let nobody say there is nothing one, holy, universal or apostolic left in the mainstream Church, any more than everything in the “Traditionalist” remnant shows forth the four Marks. Wheat and chaff are always mixed in Christ’s Church (cf. Mt. XIII, 24–30).

Kyrie eleison.

# AN EXPLANATION

No. CCLXXXII (282)

December 8, 2012

SSPX Headquarters has put out an explanation of five puzzling remarks of the Superior General. They puzzle more than ever.

An acquaintance sent to me recently a copy circularized to all SSPX priests by SSPX Headquarters (HQ) of an official explanation of five possibly troubling remarks of the SSPX's Superior General (SG), and this person asked for my opinion. I honestly think that Superiors of the SSPX might be as troubled as before. Very briefly, here is why:—

Firstly, in Austria in May, the SG said that the SSPX needed to re-think its relations with Rome. HQ explains that this was no change of the SSPX's position on Newrome, but merely a call for SSPX members to recognize that not everything said by Newromans is nonsense. However, the priests who heard the original words in Austria understood the SG to be meaning the same as what he wrote in the Society's in-house magazine of last March (Cor Unum), namely that the "new situation" in the Church "requires that we take up a new position with respect to the official Church," because since 2006 "we have witnessed a development in the Church." Does HQ have an explanation for these written words of the SG?

Secondly, on the same occasion the SG is meant to have said that the potential agreement with Rome would mean every chapel less than three years old being pulled down. HQ explains that in fact the SG said that where the SSPX had said Mass for more than three years, a chapel could be set up. However, the SG did also say that wherever the SSPX had ministered for less than three years, it might continue its ministry in private, which implies that any public buildings must be disused.

Thirdly, on CNS, also in May, the SG spoke of religious liberty being "very, very limited." HQ explains that the SG was speaking of "true religious liberty," i.e. as the Church has always taught it, namely the right limited to the Catholic religion. However the SG's original words on CNS are as clear as clear can be, and verifiable by anybody with the Internet: "The Council was presenting a religious liberty which was in fact a very, very limited one – very limited." HQ may need here to provide a second explanation to prove that its first explanation was not, at best, a mistake?

Fourthly, in Écône in September, the SG admitted that he had been wrong in his dealings with Rome. HQ explains that the mistake was only on a “very precise and limited point,” namely whether the Pope would insist or not on the SSPX accepting the Council. However, this insistence on the Council (along with the New Mass) is the total bone of contention between the SSPX and Newrome. Is not this explanation of HQ like saying that the gash made by the iceberg in the side of the Titanic was a very precise and limited gash?

Fifthly, years ago the SG said that the Council texts are “95% acceptable.” HQ explains that he was speaking of the letter and not of the spirit of the texts. However, what mother will give to her children any part of a cake which she knows is 5% poisoned? It is true that she could in theory give them any part of the 95% not poisoned, but in practice will she not be afraid of the poisoning spirit behind all parts of the cake?

In conclusion, had the SSPX’s crisis of this spring and summer made me wonder about the competence and honesty of the SG and his HQ, I fear that after this explanation of five quotes I would still be wondering. May God be with them, because they have a daunting responsibility.

Kyrie eleison.

# FAREWELL, WIMBLEDON

No. CCLXXXIII (283)

*December 15, 2012*

The bishop expelled from the Newsociety is expelled also from Wimbledon. He stays near London and will travel again.

So I have moved out of Wimbledon, which at least corresponds to the reality of my supposed “expulsion” from the Society of St Pius X. But the move is not without its sadness, because I spent there nearly four years after my real expulsion from Argentina, and they have been happy years, despite everything. Perhaps the main happiness has been the company of the priests in SSPX headquarters in England, St George’s House. They have been very good company. May God bless each of them.

However one thing I must say. People ask why I left the Society. I did not leave the Society. The Society left me, by abandoning the principles for which I joined it. Once again, the parallel with Vatican II is exact. Just as countless Catholic priests, religious and layfolk were abandoned by the churchmen who opted in the 1960’s for the Council, so a number of faithful priests and laity are being abandoned in the 2010’s by the leaders of the Society as these choose to head for peace with their “new friends in Rome” – quote of the Society’s First Assistant. The blindness is astonishing, for those who can see. It is all too natural for those who cannot see. May God have mercy on them. I do believe that these leaders have never understood what Archbishop Lefebvre was all about. They are children of their age.

The only substantial reason given for their “expelling” me was disobedience. But the only substantial disobedience on my part was the repeated refusal to close down these “Eleison Comments.” Yet when I asked the Superior General on two different occasions to specify which precise numbers of the “Comments” were so problematic, each time he did not give an answer, no doubt because he would have had to admit that the real problem was one of content, namely my resolute opposition to his suicidal approach to Conciliar Rome. Instead he continues to pretend, that the problem is one of discipline, thus diverting attention away from the real problem. And I am not the first priest and I will not be the last that he treats in this way. May God give him light. He risks chasing out many of his true friends in order to please his true

enemies, just like Pope Paul VI did with Archbishop Lefebvre. The parallels never end. The Newchurch and the Newsociety are the same malady of our age.

So what now? I borrow a friend's flat in the vicinity of London for a few weeks at best, for a few months at worst, until I can find suitable property to rent for 6 or 12 months. At this point I still do not believe in making any permanent arrangements. Alas, I shall not be easy to contact because my friend has to be discreet out of care for his neighbours. In any case snail mail will reach me through P.O. Box 423, Deal CT14 4BF, England. (but please don't send Christmas cards. I send none). From December 13 to January 3 I plan to make an apostolic visit to Canada and the USA, Deo volente, and immediately after that a visit to France for the Feast of the Epiphany.

Also changing will be some aspects of how my spoken and written words are published. The format and method of delivery of "Eleison Comments" may change too, but what I hope will not change is their appearing every Saturday through December and into the New Year. . Thank you for all your contributions to the St Marcel Initiative. In case you were concerned, I can promise you that they have not gone astray. Happy Christmas.

Kyrie eleison.

# CHRIST BORN

No. CCLXXXIV (284)

*December 22, 2012*

As Christendom is burnt out, so Christmas becomes a more and more artificial celebration. Yet Christ did come, and gave us happiness.

The appeal of the divine baby in the arms of his Virgin Mother still makes of Christmas the most popular of Christian Feasts, but as the world turns away from God, so the heart and soul of the Nativity Scene fade out, and “Christmassy” feelings become more and more fake. Truly Christendom is burnt out. It is time to turn back with the liturgy of Mother Church to the ages before Christ when wise men rejoiced intensely in the expectation of his coming. For them, it alone made sense of the unhappiness of mankind being ravaged by the consequences of original sin. It was their great hope, and it could not be shaken. The Christ would come, and with him the gates of Heaven would be open once more to souls of good will. Here are the Antiphons of the fourth Sunday of Advent, composed from texts of the Old Testament.

“Blow the trumpet in Sion, because the day of the Lord is near: behold, he will come to save us, allelujah, allelujah.” If men do not want to be saved, then they can hardly understand what they were born for, and they must die in a greater or lesser degree of despair. But if we want to be happy for all eternity, and if we know that Jesus Christ alone makes that possible, then how must we rejoice that he came!

“Behold, the desired of all nations will come, and the house of the Lord will be filled with glory, allelujah.” As original sin is universal, so the Magi came from strange and distant lands to adore their Saviour in Bethlehem, and they could have come from all nations of the world in desire of him. Since their time, Christians have indeed come from all nations to find their Saviour in his Catholic Church, and they have filled it with the glory of beautiful ceremonies, buildings, vestments, art and music, ever since.

“The crooked shall become straight, and the rough ways smooth: come, O Lord, and do not delay.” Four thousand years on from the Fall of Adam and Eve, the world had become quite crooked. Two thousand years ago the most astonishing transformation of mankind began with Our Lord being born. For centuries we have taken for granted

that smooth ways of civilization will remain smooth, but with men's spurning of Christ those ways are turning rougher than ever – see any newspaper of today. Come, O Lord, come back, and do not delay, because otherwise we shall all be devouring one another like wild beasts.

"The Lord will come, go to meet him, saying: "Great is his beginning, and of his kingdom there will be no end: God, Mighty, Lord of all, Prince of Peace, allelujah, allelujah." With such words maybe the Magi greeted the Christ Child when after long travels they found him. Converts of today, after long travails in the desert of godlessness, may still find similar words to remind us of how the Child in the crib should be greeted. Without him the world cannot have peace, and it stands on the brink of another terrible war. Divine Child, come, do not delay, or we perish.

"Thy Almighty Word, O Lord, will leap from thy royal throne, allelujah." Christmas is the Second Person of the Holy Trinity descending all the way from Heaven, being clothed in a feeble human nature and being born of a human Mother to buy us back from slavery to the Devil and re-open the gates of Heaven for souls of good will, ready to believe. Divine Child, I believe. Help thou my unbelief, and help with special graces on the Feast of your birth millions and millions of unbelieving souls.

Kyrie eleison.

# CULTURE ALERT

No. CCLXXXV (285)

*December 29, 2012*

A friend writes that he sees the Newsociety failing to denounce cultural problems. This failure makes it more than vulnerable.

As the leadership of the Society of St Pius X seems to be faltering, so Catholics who love the Society because they have received so much from it in years gone by might be tempted to think that there is nothing much that they as simple faithful can do about it. They would be wrong. Let them read these reflections from a friend of mine, and they should be able to read between the lines that if God does not rescue the Society for them, as of course he could do, then it has at least in part depended on them. My friend's letter is adapted here below:—

“A practical agreement would be ruinous to the cause of Catholic Tradition. One need only look at what has happened to the Traditional Redemptorists in Scotland . . . The two Masses cannot co-exist. One will always drive the other out . . . At a Novus Ordo Mass I attended recently, the whole church was pervaded by chatter and continual clapping . . . The two sides are simply too far apart for an agreement to work. No meeting of the minds is possible between modernity and Tradition.

“Then there is the profound revolution which has overwhelmed modern civilization, including the Traditional movement, and which has for the most part been missed by the leadership of Tradition . . . Electronic technology has wrought a cultural revolution in our lives, especially of the younger generation. If it is not managed properly, it certainly weakens the faith because it can take over people's whole lives. Youngsters are liable to be captured by it. They hang on it all day long. People too engulfed in it become dysfunctional, unable to get up in the morning, or to maintain a live conversation, or to hold down a job.

“Now if a sports team is not admonished by its coach, its playing standards begin to fall. If Catholics are not admonished on cultural issues like music, women's dress, or watching television, their cultural standards begin to fall, which has profound implications for their faith. Traditional parents are being left to struggle alone with their families to keep the worldliness of modern society out of their homes, because



the leadership of the SSPX has either missed this cultural revolution, or it is not giving it the attention that it deserves. I have had many long discussions with Traditional families who are concerned about the way that the Traditional movement is going. Religious movements must take a stand on cultural issues if they are to flourish. Tradition was strengthened when it used to take a stand on television. But if a stand is not taken on cultural issues, the stand on doctrinal issues soon begins to weaken.

“The latest Chapter of the SSPX may have pulled the organization back from the brink, but I cannot take much comfort from it. It spent much attention on defining the parameters of any future discussions with Rome in making an agreement. Yet, Rome is basically unchanged from 1988. In my opinion, the SSPX needs to recover the prophetic role that it performed when Archbishop Lefebvre was still alive. The Traditional movement needs to strongly denounce the modernism and liberalism that is leading the Catholic Church to its destruction. These denunciations lately have been muted. Perhaps many Traditional priests are distracted by the comforts that they think an agreement with Rome would bring them.”

Over to you, dear readers. Away with trashy and valueless music in the home. Get rid of the television set. Reduce electronics to a minimum. Mothers, wear skirts whenever possible, which is most of the time. Otherwise do not complain if God does not rescue the Society. He forces his gifts upon nobody. Blessed be his name for ever.

Kyrie eleison.